

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 5, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable KEN CALVERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rabbi Toby H. Manewith, Director, Hillel Foundation, A.S. Kay Spiritual Life Center, American University, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"The world rests on 3 things: On din, justice, on emet, truth and on shalom, peace." This, according to Shimon Ben Gamliel, the first century Jewish sage. Though these concepts are intertwined, the first two are valued, in part, as agents; it is through them that peace is attained. And peace, say the sages, is but another name for that which human beings of all walks and stations see as divine.

Most Holy One,
May our pursuits be of justice,
And may truth light our way.
And through these may we, our leaders, our Nation, its citizens, and citizens of the world, be guided on a path of ever increasing peace.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ETHERIDGE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

WELCOME TO RABBI TOBY H. MANEWITH

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in having presented to the House for the prayer, Rabbi Toby Manewith. She is a constituent of mine from Chicago, where she lived until her graduation from Northwestern University in 1988. She was ordained from Hebrew Union College in 1993.

Her first post was as Hillel Director at Syracuse University, a post she held for 4 years. She took an assignment at American University last summer, where she is now.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this young rabbi has much to offer and I know we wish her well.

BLM INVESTIGATION URGED

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Everett Dirksen once said that "a billion here and a billion there, and pretty soon you are talking about real money." Well, is \$1.7 trillion of a Federal budget not enough to provide for the simple upkeep and maintenance of our national park system? Clearly the Bureau of Land Management does not think so.

After complaining of a shortage of necessary funds to provide for the upkeep of the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area, the BLM imposed a new user fee on anyone wishing to enter this national treasure. Well, what improvements have been made as a result of this hidden tax on the American people? None. Zip. Nada. In fact, the BLM used its own discretion to divert these funds it deemed necessary for improvements just to hire more government bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when all Americans are being asked to do more with less to balance the Federal budget, government bureaucrats must be held to the same standard. I urge a full and complete investigation into this blatant misuse of taxpayer funds.

BULLETPROOF VESTS SAVE LIVES

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I call on this Congress to take action to save the lives of America's brave law enforcement officers.

Two days ago at 4 o'clock in the morning in Kenley, NC, a police officer by the name of Todd Smith stopped a dark sedan on Highway 301 for missing tags. Those 3 men attacked him, took his weapon, shot him at point-blank range in his midsection.

Fortunately for Todd Smith, he was wearing a bulletproof vest that was 10 times the strength of steel. They took him to Johnston Memorial Hospital. His life was saved. The doctor said if he had not been wearing a vest, he would have died on the spot.

Mr. Speaker, each and every law enforcement officer in America should have the protection of a bulletproof vest. We have legislation to accomplish this. I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2829, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant. It is now tied up in a committee. The Republican leadership has refused to allow it to move. That is outrageous. In the name of Officer Smith and all law enforcement officers, I demand that this bill pass.

PAKISTAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus attention on the situation facing minority religious believers in Pakistan. Although the country's constitution upholds religious freedom, section 295(c) of the penal code states that defiling the sacred name of Mohammed is punishable by death. Unfortunately, reports suggest that some Pakistanis use this law, which carries with it a mandatory death penalty, to falsely accuse Christians of blasphemy.

Let me illustrate with several photographs. The first photograph reveals a young woman sitting in the midst of the destruction caused when the government bulldozed the Christian church and surrounding community buildings. The second photograph shows the view of Reverend Noor Alam, a Christian clergyman lynched by extremists recently in Pakistan. The next photograph depicts the treatment of Pakistani Christians who protested

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

last year's destruction of churches in Shantinagar. Members can see the ropes around their necks.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of religion is a fundamental human right and should be protected by all governments of the world, including the government of Pakistan.

DEMOCRATS UNVEIL EDUCATION AGENDA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, every day all across America we tell children that education is very important to their future. But we send them a contradictory message in the condition of American schools. If we truly want to convince children of the importance of education, we must improve the schools at which they learn and reduce class size. Just a few weeks ago, the Democratic leadership of the House and the Senate joined with President Clinton in rolling out a Democratic agenda which calls for smaller classes, it calls for 100,000 new teachers to teach in these smaller classes, and an initiative to repair old schools and build new schools. This initiative of President Clinton's which I hope the entire Congress will join in calls for a \$20 billion initiative on tax-free bonds for local communities to rebuild their schools. The schools our children learn in are in some cases environmental hazards. In many cases the classrooms are overcrowded. In all cases there is need for reconstruction. Send a clear, consistent message to children that education is important by placing an importance on their schools.

DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION INITIATIVE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this body has no greater challenge than to make sure that all of America's children no matter how humble their background have access to a quality education. Education is the great equalizer in our Nation. It is what has allowed the daughter of a garment worker like myself to grow up to be a Member of the House of Representatives. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to dismantle public education, to siphon off precious funds into risky voucher proposals. Democrats have a plan to strengthen America's public schools by repairing and modernizing crumbling schools, putting 100,000 teachers in the classroom to promote stronger discipline and better learning, and to cut down on class size. America's public schools have made our Nation strong and put the American

dream within reach for so many of our Nation's children. I urge my Republican colleagues not to abandon our children but to follow the Democrats' lead in working to rebuild America's public schools and to maintain strong public education in this Nation.

OUR LIBERAL FRIENDS

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the President and his allies in this House are calling us the Do-Nothing Congress. I agree. We are the do-nothing-the-liberals-like Congress. Maybe that is why the poll numbers for Congress are at an all-time high, because this Congress will not do anything to the American people. We will not raise their taxes, we will not stick them with unfunded mandates, we will not drive their small businesses out of business, we will not kill the economy, we will not spend the surplus, we will not waste their hard-earned money. I understand that the minority leadership has another agenda and we are hearing it this morning. When Democrats have another so-called agenda, the American taxpayer should have a panic attack. You can say this about our liberal friends on the other side of the aisle. They got what it takes to take what you got. Let us face the facts. The American people want a break from more wasteful Washington programs no matter what our liberal friends might say.

DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION INITIATIVE

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a long-term vision, the vision of the Democratic Party to support education in America, to invest in our young people. The fact of the matter is that while a short-term tax cut may be nice, your children's future is tied to education. Education is the key to opportunity. Right now we like to talk about the new jobs, the global jobs, the high-tech jobs. But the fact of the matter is that without a good education, we cannot get those jobs. Right now American employers are looking overseas to hire people because our system does not provide enough qualified, well-educated young people. How can we address this problem? The Democrats advocate first improving our schools. Over a third of our schools need major repairs.

□ 1015

Over 50 percent of our schools are not prepared or wired for the Internet. We have class sizes that are too large, and we lack discipline in the schools. The

Democrats advocate a major investment in education to repair our schools. The Democrats advocate a major investment in hiring 100,000 new teachers so we can have smaller classrooms, better discipline and provide a better educated workforce to take on the new jobs of the new millennium.

FREEDOM WORKS AWARD TO FAMILY MISSIONS

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to present the Freedom Works Award to the Family Missions of the D.C. area. I established the Freedom Works Award to celebrate freedom by recognizing individuals and groups who promote personal responsibility instead of reliance on the government.

The Family Missions was founded in 1968 and has chapters in most cities across the United States. It is a privately funded charitable religious organization made up of families who believe their Christian duty is best served by assisting and operating homeless shelters, soup kitchens and offering other human services assistance within their communities. Their activities have ranged from delivering 2 tons of milk weekly for the last 4 years to D.C.-area soup kitchens, to serving as Red Cross deputies in Florida during the aftermath of Hurricane Andrew.

It really warms my heart to see these young people doing all they can to help people in need. The Family Missions volunteers also help teenage runaways and shelters for battered women. This organization has taken on these difficult tasks and more without receiving a single penny of Federal assistance. Instead, they have relied on the personal initiative taken by Cindy Thompson, Sam Lloyd, Brian Thomas Edwards and Lisa Salazar, and a long list of other members of the family.

The success of the Family Missions is based on the simple belief that there is no greater love for our fellow man than to be willing to lay down our life for them.

Mr. Speaker, government alone cannot solve our Nation's problems. That does not mean we simply throw up our hands in frustration. It means every single one of us, no matter what our politics, must roll up our sleeves and do the work each of us is capable of doing to rebuild our neighborhoods and communities. Every day groups like the Family Missions demonstrate the understanding that with freedom comes responsibility.

Sadly enough, there is far more homelessness and hunger in this great Nation than any of us are willing to accept. Poor and distressed people need hope, they need love, they need people willing to come to them, if necessary,

who will show they care. They found all these things and more in the Family Missions.

If we are a great country today, then if we are going to be a great country in the future, it will be because of groups like Family Missions.

FOCUS ON HELPING CHILDREN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important challenges we have as we move toward the 21st century is to make sure that the children of America really count. In order to do that, there are so many needs that children have. One of them, of course, is the rebuilding of our schools and better school infrastructure.

Almost one-third of our public schools were built prior to the beginning of World War II in 1939, and an in-depth study shows that one-third of the 80,000 public elementary and secondary schools in the United States, about 26,000 have at least one building in need of extensive repair. The Democrats' rebuilding school bill is the right direction for our children.

Children must be in the forefront of our mind, the same way that the Congressional Children's Caucus next week will hold an important hearing on access to mental health resources for our children. Eleven million children have a diagnosable mental, emotional behavioral disorder, and 1 in 20 will have severe disorder by age 18.

This is an important cause, our children are an important cause. I hope that our colleagues will focus their attention in the next couple of months in helping our children.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT PROSECUTORIAL ABUSE

(Mr. MCDADE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation cosponsored by our colleague JACK MURTHA that will safeguard the citizens of this Nation from unfair, abusive and unethical conduct by rogue employees of the Department of Justice.

The bill establishes clear standards of conduct for Department of Justice employees and makes them accountable for transgressions.

The legislation makes it punishable, for example, for a DOJ employee to engage in actions such as seeking the indictment of a person without probable cause, failing to release information that would exonerate someone under indictment, or misleading the court.

An independent review board is created to monitor compliance with those

standards, and that board would have the authority to impose penalties on those found guilty, all of this done in public.

For the information of my colleagues, I am submitting for the record a lengthy list of cases where U.S. courts have found prosecutorial abuse. This list was prepared by the Library of Congress at my request.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill, which would ensure the constitutional rights of American citizens.

SUPPORT MORE TEACHERS AND MORE REPAIRS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. ROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, public school education has made this country the most productive and advanced country on the planet. It is the key that opens the door of opportunities to achieve the American dream. It is not only where we learn our common American heritage and our common values, but it is where we can set a high level of achievement and expectation for all American students.

Supporters of public schools understand that our public schools must get better, but let us start at the beginning, grades 1, 2 and 3. That is why I support President Clinton's 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size. Smaller class sizes mean more individualized attention for all of our kids, and a safer and better environment in which they can learn.

But there are those in the extreme who want to tear down our public schools and take money from them, to eliminate the opportunity for all Americans to be able to achieve the American dream.

I urge my colleagues to support President Clinton's plan to reduce class size for 100,000 more schoolteachers, and to provide repairs to the needy school districts whose school buildings are in disrepair.

HOPE NOW FOR YOUTH

(Mr. RADANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have begun to downsize the institution of government through privatizing, localizing and eliminating Federal programs, and returning more power, money and decision-making to families and local communities. But that is not enough. As a society, we must release the power of religious and civic organizations to solve local problems.

One such organization is Hope Now for Youth in Fresno, California. Hope

Now for Youth hires religious, ethnic college students to serve as counselors for young men in Fresno who are involved in risky behavior. The counselors seek to provide the parenting that these kids have missed growing up. Other services include job training, job placement, and help with meeting basic needs.

Hope Now for Youth does all of this without any government money. It is funded by individuals and businesses in Fresno who have taken personal responsibility to rebuild their own communities. It relies heavily on volunteers who give of their time and their love.

Mr. Speaker, Hope Now for Youth is an effective local charity that is a positive role model for all Americans. Local charities like Hope Now for Youth deserve our support. Anyone wishing to find out more may contact my office.

GET ADVICE ON EDUCATION FROM EDUCATORS

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have ridiculed the President's proposal to hire 100,000 new teachers and to reduce class size to 18. I would suggest that they may want to get out of Washington and talk to some real people about this issue. I did just that last weekend.

My daughter, Alanna, is a third grade public schoolteacher in the suburbs of Cincinnati, Ohio, and I had a chance to visit with Alanna. I asked her, "What do you think about the President's proposal?" She said, "Well, dad, right now my class size is 25. If it were reduced to 18, I could be a better teacher. I could spend more time with the 5 or 6 kids in my class who really need help."

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my Republican colleagues, instead of blindly opposing this very important proposal by the President to reduce class size from 25 to 18, get out and talk to some public school teachers and find out what is really going on in the real world.

THE BIRTH DEFECTS PREVENTION ACT

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the United States has the most advanced health care system in the world, 3 percent of our children are born with birth defects. Approximately 150,000 babies are born each year in this country with a serious birth defect.

Although some birth defects are minor and have no permanent consequences, others cause permanent disability, which necessitates constant

medical care, special education, and other services that cost victims and their families countless tears and thousands of dollars each year. All too often, serious birth defects result in death. In fact, birth defects are the leading cause of infant death in America today.

Next week, the House will consider legislation that could dramatically reduce the incidence of birth defects in America. The Birth Defects Prevention Act, sponsored by Senator KIT BOND and passed by the Senate last year, would direct the Centers for Disease Control to serve as the national clearinghouse for the collection and storage of data on birth defects, help States establish birth defect surveillance programs or improve existing ones, and make grants available to the public and nonprofit organizations to develop and implement birth defect prevention strategies.

SUPPORT EDUCATION FOR A MODERN WORKFORCE: OPPOSE VOUCHERS

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important than giving every child a chance for good education. Our economy is changing and technology is more important than ever. We must prepare our students to compete in a growing, global economy. That is why Democrats want to strengthen our public schools, build and renovate more than 5,000 schools, reduce the class size to 18, hire over 100,000 teachers, and ensure that every child has a chance to get ahead in our society.

What do Republicans propose? Just yesterday the majority leader came to this floor and suggested draining funds from our public schools for private school vouchers. This plan would weaken our public schools; it would help the few and deprive the many. That is the Republican plan. It is not right, it is not fair to the majority of our students, it is the wrong road to travel.

Mr. Speaker, we must support strong public schools for every student in America.

A BUDGET DEAL IS A DEAL

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, back home we say a deal is a deal and a bargain is a bargain. A farmer back in Minnesota described our deficit dilemma best when he said the problem is not that we are not sending enough money into Washington; the problem is that Washington spends it faster than

we can send it in. In other words, "It is spending, stupid."

When I came to Washington, the Congressional Budget Office was predicting \$200 billion deficits for as far as the eye could see, well into the next millennium. Well, since I came to Washington, we have eliminated over 300 programs, reformed welfare, and dramatically cut the growth of spending here in Washington. As a result, the Federal budget is balanced today.

Last August we set tough spending caps. Now the President wants to renege.

This is what the President is recommending. The blue line represents what we agreed to spend in our spending caps. Now the President wants to exceed those by \$69 billion.

Mr. Speaker, a deal is a deal. Keep faith with the caps. Let us pay down some of the debt, and slow down the Washington spending machine.

INCREASING FAIRNESS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support for legislation I will introduce this afternoon to increase fairness in international trade.

As my record shows, I am a strong supporter of fair trade and expanding markets for American products. Regardless of whether we vote to use more American money to replenish the IMF accounts, we already are the largest contributor to the fund. As such, it is our obligation to speak up for what is right.

□ 1030

My bill is focused on what the Asians should do to help themselves by upholding their trade reform commitments and ensuring fair trade. We need to take responsibility as world leader in trade and democracy.

This bill would use our voice and vote in the international finance institutions to insist that promised market opening reforms are carried out in Asia. I urge my colleagues to support the Asian Trade Reform and Implementation Act; it would send a strong message to Asia: Open your doors to U.S. products.

THE SITUATION IN KOSOVA

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, democracy is struggling to take root in Kosova despite the continued pattern of Serb violence against the ethnic Albanian population. Parliamentary and

presidential elections are scheduled to be taken in Kosova on March 22. This will be the first general election this volatile region has had since 1992 and it represents a landmark event for the 90 percent Albanian population in Kosova in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Today we are just hearing reports of artillery shelling and aerial bombing of villages, part of a continuing pattern of violence against the ethnic Albanian population by the Serbs. This must stop. I call upon President Clinton to initiate strong measures, including tougher sanctions against the Belgrade Government of President Milosevic. For the sake of the ethnic Albanian people in Kosov, and a lasting peace in this troubled region, we cannot allow this violence to continue.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS COMMITTED TO FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the most recent estimates show that we are actually going to have a budget surplus for fiscal year 1998 if all continues to go well this year.

I rise to make a couple of comments about that. First of all, I think we can all be proud of that accomplishment. It was just 5 years ago that the deficit was \$300 billion and climbing, with no end in sight. It was depressing to look as the interest on the debt rose to the point where we felt we would never get out of that hole. Now we are starting to make progress and can be proud of that.

I feel that both parties can have some degree of credit for that accomplishment. But as a Democrat, I am particularly proud that my party has shown that it can be fiscally responsible. It can be fiscally responsible, where at the same time caring about other things that are important to the American people: investing in our future through education, protecting our seniors by making sure that they have health care and Social Security.

One final point. While we have accomplished a lot, there is still much to accomplish. Fiscal responsibility is not accomplished in one day. You cannot do it once and forget about it. It is a continual task. In the months and years ahead we must remain committed to that fiscal responsibility. I am proud that my party has made that commitment.

WIRELESS PRIVACY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Commerce now printed in the bill. Each section of the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule to H.R. 2369 which provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and

ranking member of the Committee on Commerce. The rule also waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the 3-day availability of committee reports.

House Resolution 377 also makes the Committee on Commerce amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and provides that it shall be considered as read.

The rule allows for priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Votes may be postponed during consideration of the bill, and voting time may be reduced to 5 minutes if the postponed vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to reconsider, with or without instructions.

The right to privacy is one of the most sacred rights our Founding Fathers fought and died to establish. Since the early days of our Nation, subsequent generations have defended this right. Today, advanced technology provides the latest threat to each individual's privacy.

I was shocked to hear during testimony before the Committee on Rules yesterday that the FBI actually had to stop using cellular phones during the investigation of the TWA Flight 800 disaster because they were being intercepted by members of the press corps. We have to put a stop to that sort of thing.

It is not the high-tech geniuses that we have to worry about. Off-the-shelf scanners are easily modified to turn them into electronic stalking devices. Simply clip the correct wire and someone can listen in on your private conversations. An entire industry which produces these intrusive devices has sprung up.

H.R. 2369 is a bipartisan bill which will clearly permit the modification of scanners. It requires the FCC to develop regulations which extend existing protections to new services, including personal communications services, protected paging, and specialized mobile services. H.R. 2369 clearly states that intercepting wireless communications is illegal.

Finally, the bill requires that the FCC must investigate violations under this law. H.R. 2369 is a bipartisan bill which moved quickly through the Committee on Commerce and should be supported by the entire House. I urge all my colleagues to support this open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 377 is an open rule allowing for full and free debate on a bill that seeks to enhance privacy for all commercial users of cellular technology, both analog and digital. H.R. 2369 takes into account the

development of new technologies in digital cellular and digital personal communications services, the generations beyond analog wireless communication.

The bill also prohibits the manufacture or modification of off-the-shelf radio scanners which would be capable of intercepting digital cellular telephone communications. It is already illegal to manufacture or import such equipment capable of intercepting analog cellular communication; this legislation advances Federal law to deal with advances in technology since the law was enacted.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires the Federal Communications Commission to step up its enforcement of existing laws, as well as the new prohibitions which will be imposed by this proposal. This legislation makes a significant change in current law by providing that the act of scanning cellular communications is in and of itself illegal. Thus, the manufacture or the possession of the equipment capable of scanning these private conversations, as well as the actual scanning of private cellular communications, will be illegal.

Mr. Speaker, with enhanced enforcement on the part of the FCC, perhaps some of the predatory practices which threaten the privacy of the millions of cellular conversations that take place each and every day can be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce, and is one of importance in today's world of rapidly changing technological development. I urge support of this open rule and support of the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me time and I rise in strong support of this open rule.

I commend my friend from Louisiana, Chairman TAUZIN, for his leadership on this issue. He's right—we need to tighten current laws on wireless privacy. It's important to ensure that our constituents are afforded privacy protections when they are using their cell phones or other wireless devices. But we should remember that under current law it is already illegal to tap into wireless conversation—both Congress and the FCC have spoken on this matter.

It is abundantly clear that telecommunications technology is exceeding our regulatory protective efforts. As Chairman TAUZIN testified in the Rules Committee yesterday, with the clip of a wire an off-the-shelf scanner can become a stalking device. Even FBI agents have testified that they no longer use their cellular phones for fear of being tapped.

H.R. 2369 makes some good improvements and toughens the penalties in certain cases—this is progress. But we need to recognize that no law will guarantee our privacy without rigorous enforcement of the law. As the cellular industry grows so will this problem—today's scanner crisis will be something far different tomorrow. What we can and must do is insist

that the folks we charge with administering and enforcing these laws do so. I am hopeful that his commonsense legislation will send a strong message that we are serious about punishing those individuals who perpetrate these assaults on personal privacy.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Pursuant to House Resolution 377 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2369.

□ 1041

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, with Mr. CALVERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me take a moment to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for his outstanding effort on this important matter, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). They have done fine work on this issue, and deserve the appreciation of the House. It is only because of their efforts that we are able to present this bipartisan package of amendments to the current wireless privacy law contained in H.R. 2369.

The House should know that while the Committee on Commerce learned about the problems of wireless privacy laws as a result of a phone call between the leaders of the House that was intercepted by a Florida couple, wireless privacy is not a partisan issue. The Clinton White House has to routinely

remind its employees not to use cellular or pager communications for sensitive material because of eavesdropping. I believe all Members of this House would like their cellular calls to remain private.

In my own case, I had my cellular number pirated by somebody with a device, and ended up getting bills for calls from Baltimore and Annapolis when the House was in session.

H.R. 2369 is an effort to clarify that not all wireless communications are in the public domain. The airwaves are a public good, but the public is not free to intercept all wireless communications that just happen to pass through the air nearby. Congress made a decision long ago to protect private wireless conversations and reaffirmed it in 1992. Private wireless conversations deserve privacy protections from unwanted listeners. Public communications, where there is no expectation of privacy, do not.

H.R. 2369 places new restrictions on scanner manufacturers to protect the development of the new wireless communications. The bill extends prohibitions on scanners capable of intercepting cellular frequency to other wireless technologies such as personal communications services and protected paging and specialized mobile radio services. Thus, we are making the determination that scanners should not be capable of intercepting these new communication services. This is the right policy to make.

Let me make it clear, though, that H.R. 2369 does not outlaw scanners nor restrict the manufacturers of scanners that enable scanning public communications.

□ 1045

This body recognizes that people use scanners for legitimate purposes. Our Nation's public safety community uses scanners to monitor emergency calls, coordinate appropriate responses, and provide assistance to our citizens in need. Congress has always had a strong appreciation for the members of the public safety community. We want to make sure that the public safety officials that put their lives on the line every day for our constituents are not threatened by undue scanner prohibitions. Scanners are not necessarily an evil.

However, it is also clear that some people use scanners for harmful, inappropriate activities. At the hearing on this issue, we learned that the news media is one of the largest violators of the law, often interfering with criminal or sensitive investigations of the police or enforcement agencies for their own gain.

To address this problem, H.R. 2369 tightens the prohibitions on intercepting wireless communications. These changes will expand the range of fines for violators and will make inter-

ception alone illegal. The changes will also force the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and enforce penalties for violators of these communications statutes.

Together, the new scanner restrictions and the heightened privacy standards will increase consumer security and privacy. Nothing can guarantee complete privacy for wireless communications. We must try to increase the privacy afforded users step-by-step.

H.R. 2369 does take the next positive step, and I ask all Members to support H.R. 2369. It is a balanced bill that will go a long way to help wireless communication users without threatening the legitimate use of scanners.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by complimenting the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), chairman of the subcommittee, for the exemplary work which he has done on this legislation. It is very important legislation and it is legislation that really does help to fill a vacuum which has been created because of the advent of the digital era.

Mr. Chairman, I also thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the full committee, for his work in making sure that this legislation is moved quickly, constructed properly, and that the American public get this protection as quickly as possible.

I also express my thanks on our side to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and all the Members who have been very much concerned about this legislation, who as well deserve credit for how quickly we have moved it out here.

In 1992, back in an era long gone by now when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection, I passed a piece of legislation which was signed into law by President Bush, outlawing radio scanners which were capable of listening in on cellular phone conversations because it was and it is illegal to eavesdrop on cellular phone conversations. The legislative intent at that time was to ensure that people could not manufacture, import, sell, or use scanners that allowed people to eavesdrop on people's cellular phone conversations.

The bill that we are dealing with today is quite straightforward. It is simply an extension of that previous policy, but catching up with the rapid change in technology. The central point of the bill to simply extend the prohibition on the manufacturing of scanners to include not only cellular frequencies but also the frequencies used by the next generation of wireless

technology, so-called PCS technologies, which are really digital technologies, microcellular telephone systems.

Mr. Chairman, digital technology actually makes it more difficult for unethical people to eavesdrop on individuals' private conversations, but it is not in and of itself a fail-safe technological inoculation against privacy invasions. For that reason, I believe that this legislation is absolutely necessary today. We must pass it.

In addition, I think that we should discuss as well the whole question of encryption policy. That is what kind of sound encryption policy can we put on the books in order to give people the ability to protect themselves with the best privacy-enhancing tools possible.

Mr. Chairman, important ethical questions loom for us. In fact, as a society, this rapid technological change affects us all, no matter where we live, no matter which technology we now use. And although aspects of our evolving national telecommunications policy and networks represent a new frontier from a technological standpoint, we must always remember that the fundamental principles of right and wrong stay the same whether we are in the real world or we are in the virtual world. The same fundamental principles have to remain intact.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that we need to establish basic privacy principles for the telecommunications arena. Just because personal information can be collected, just because it can be gleaned off of the airwaves, off of the Internet, or can be cross-referenced by computers into sophisticated data lists for sale to others, does not mean that it has been technologically predetermined that privacy rights and societal values have to bend to that technology.

Last year I introduced legislation that would establish a Privacy Bill of Rights for the information age. And I hope that we can begin to have the kinds of discussion in this Congress, in this country, that would ensure that we have fully dealt with the implications of this technological revolution, that we have given the technologically savvy protections to people that they are going to need to protect their financial data, their health data, their personal information, and that they have real rights to in fact ensure that their privacy is not in danger.

Mr. Chairman, today's bill addresses an important segment of our communications networks: The PCS wireless marketplace. It will be important for us as a society to pass this law, to give that protection, and then to move on to the even broader debate of the implications of our ever-expanding network of networks, the Internet, satellite, other wireless technologies, cable systems and others, so there is a broad-based Privacy Bill of Rights that

every American is entitled to regardless of the technology which they are using.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to using today's debate and discussion as a foundation for a larger debate about privacy in this new era, in this cyberspace era into which we have all been dragged, willingly or unwillingly, with all of our private information put out there for observation by those of which we know little and, in fact, should be quite concerned.

So I would like to say, again, the gentleman from Louisiana has identified this issue. He has been able to build a consensus on our committee that has made it possible for us to move forward in a dramatic presentation in our committee. He made quite clear to all of the Members how critical it was for us to move, and as a result, we are out here on the floor. The gentleman from Louisiana deserves great credit for this important legislation that moved so quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the full committee, for his comments and support and his active assistance in the passage of this legislation. His statement I think in a very personal way again describes how important it is for Americans not only to have an expectation of privacy, but to have those of us in policy positions to reinforce and protect that expectation of privacy.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), our colleague who last week indeed pushed forward the anticloning legislation which is aimed to protect against the cloning of telephone numbers and the stealing of people's property through that process. As the Chairman alluded to, this bill and that bill go hand-in-hand and are part of an ongoing process to redefine in a technological age privacy rights in America.

Mr. Chairman, let me quickly turn to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), my dear friend for whom my respect and admiration has always been bountiful, and which continues to grow as our relationship in Congress continues to widen and expand. Let me tell this House that very often we fail to say thank you to those who precede us in the work we do, and I want to say publicly "thank you" to the gentleman from Massachusetts, former chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection, for the very excellent work he and his committee has done in the past to build a record of support for privacy rights and the law upon which we build today an extension of those rights.

The gentleman has indeed been a leader in defining privacy rights in

America in a technological age, and I want to pledge to the gentleman and to all of his past efforts, a continuation of that debate and I hope the full fruition of his goals and objectives, because I share them in defining privacy rights, not only in telephone service but on the Internet, in the broadband area; the privacy rights that should be able to protect people in their health records and their financial records as they do electronic commerce, in their property rights, and as people conduct business over the broadband services of satellite and wireless communications systems.

In that regard, let me further elaborate on the very important need for this legislation today and again commend all of my colleagues for the unanimous vote we received in the Committee on Commerce to report this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, 43 million Americans now communicate via wireless cellular and PCS telephone devices. That does not even count the many millions of Americans who use cordless phones in their homes, which are indeed wireless devices inside our homes: 43 million Americans, 80 percent of which use wireless communications based upon the old analog system, which is easily compromised by scanners designed to do that.

In our committee room we demonstrated how with a small piece of wire and a soldering iron we could take a legal scanning device and convert it into an illegal scanning device. We used information that was being promoted on the Internet to learn how to do it. On the Internet there were companies advertising that they would take a legal scanner and convert it so that it would be a device to listen in on one's neighbors and friends as they tried to conduct private conversations on the telephone.

Literally, the problem is growing and becoming worse. We are told by the law enforcement community that while 43 million Americans are trying to communicate privately on their telephones, 10 million other Americans now have the technological power to listen in. That ought to be untenable in our society.

Mr. Chairman, the right of privacy is intricately related to our freedoms and liberty in our society. Take away the right of privacy and we deny Americans intimately of their basic rights to be free. If we cannot be free in our communications, how restricted are we in our rights to participate as citizens in a free society with thought and free speech, highly regarded and, in fact, deeply protected in our Constitution?

So we embark today on an effort to further protect the right of people to have that freedom, that right of privacy in an age when compromising communications technologically is becoming all too easy and all too accessible to people in our society.

Mr. Chairman, let me say it again, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, has said it. The fact that I have the power to do something does not give me the right to do it. The fact that I have the power to harm someone physically does not give me the legal right to do it. The fact that I have the power to walk over to my neighbor's mailbox and intercept his mail and read it does not give me the right to do so. And Federal law prohibits that activity.

In the same way, the fact that someone has the power, the capacity with a technological device to listen in on our conversations that we have an expectation of privacy about does not give that person, or anyone in our society, the right to listen in without a proper court order, because in fact a court has determined that that is permissible.

Absent that fact, we all have an expectation of privacy, and we in government ought to do everything we can to protect that expectation of privacy. That is what this bill is about. This bill is designed to say in this analog era, as we move into a digital era where encryption, that is devices that are going to try to protect privacy in conversations and Internet communications, as these encryption devices are invented and as other smart people try to find technologically how to break into those encryption systems, we have nevertheless to say in law that while someone might be able to do it, while someone might be smart enough to intercept my conversation in the digital area, they still do not have a right to do it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill says to intercept it is a crime. To take that conversation and give it to someone else is a crime. To publish it is a crime, as is currently the law. And it also says to the FCC that they do not have to wait for the Federal Justice Department to give them permission to enforce this law.

□ 1100

You have to go out and protect the 43 million Americans who have a right to that protection. In short, this bill advances the freedom of Americans. It advances privacy rights, but it is just the first step. As my friend from Massachusetts said, we have much more work to do. We have much more to do in defining people's privacy rights and indeed to protect those rights as we move into a much more complicated age of communications in our society and in the world.

I again want to thank my friend from Massachusetts for his incredible collegial effort to make this happen today and for building the base upon which this law is constructed to further improve the rights of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have witnessed in the last 50 years in our country the rapid evolution of the personal computer. Moreover we have seen in the last few years the explosive growth of that global network of such machines that is called the Internet. Interestingly, a French Jesuit priest named Teilhard de Chardin talked about this emerging worldwide web. He wrote, however, not about the sheer wonder of a linked network of machinery, but, rather, about the true intelligence of such a network, the human aspect of it. In a book called *The Formation of the Noosphere*, a half century ago, he wrote the following: No one can deny that a network, a world network, of economic and psychic affiliations is being woven at ever-increasing speed which envelops and constantly penetrates more deeply within each of us. With every day that passes, it becomes a little more possible for us to act or to think otherwise than collectively.

This philosophy foreshadowed what we would hear later from Marshall McLuhan, and McLuhan constantly made reference to that Jesuit priest, Teilhard de Chardin, when McLuhan coined the phrase "global village." But that in many ways was just secular shorthand for Teilhard's philosophy.

As a student at Boston College in the 1960s, I was taught this philosophy in the same way that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), who is Jesuit-educated, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who is the ranking Democrat on this committee who is Jesuit-educated, was also exposed to this very same philosophy of the interconnectiveness of all of us, the convergence of humans into a single massive noosphere, using the word "noos" for the word meaning "mind" in Greek.

Although Teilhard articulated his vision using a religious lexicon, his concept of a web of human connectivity that would envelop the Earth and be propelled by human consciousness sounds remarkably similar to today's Net, and because we have the chance to animate technology with human values, it is vitally important for us to ensure that the technology does not define us, but that we define the technology with the human values that we want it to embody.

There is a certain Dickensian quality to all of these technologies. It is the best of wires, and it is the worst of wires simultaneously. This wondrous set of telecommunications skills and technologies that makes it possible to build this new world of electronic commerce, to make it possible for children and schools across the country to be able to communicate on it, also has the capacity to compromise our privacy, to insinuate itself into our daily lives in ways in which we never anticipated.

The legislation which we have before us today is a very important step to-

wards protecting citizens, animating it with human values that reflects the best of what humanity believes this technology can provide for us. While limiting the negative consequences, the unintended consequences that so much is a part of the very same dual personality of these technologies.

Again, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. Having been educated at Harvard on the Bayou, Nicholls State College in Louisiana, I deeply respect that philosophical training my friend has had. I take it from that that the Irish Catholic community is in support of this bill, and so is the Cajun Catholic community.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I was going to ask the gentleman if he could translate what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) said.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen. Between the two of them they have hit every segment of the American educational level. We appreciate that.

However, I have to admit I understand him better than I do you. He speaks English.

The cellular telephone industry is growing rapidly. As we know, there is currently about 56 million Americans that use cellular phones today. One of the things that Thomas Jefferson said early on was there are three things we ought to do in America. One is take care of our foreign affairs, two is deliver the mail, and three is protect this Nation and the general welfare. That is precisely what this bill does, protects our people, this great America, against intrusion by anyone.

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for coming to the telecommunications corridor in Richardson, Texas, which is just north of Dallas. As my colleagues know, every company, just about, is represented there. I would invite the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to accompany the gentleman next time.

I tell my colleagues, the advance of technology is such that something has to be done to protect the American people. If Members recall, last week, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has already discussed it, Congress outlawed equipment that allows criminals to steal telephone numbers and run up bills to unsuspecting users. Today we are protecting the right to private conversation over cellular phones. If I am talking to my accountant, my banker, my wife or my children, I want to have the security that no one is recording my call or putting it out on CNN.

This bill does that, and it protects private conversation between two people. That is what America is all about. The gentleman mentioned it, the freedoms that we enjoy, that our servicemen have fought so long and so many years over to protect. Now we are adding one more protection.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for their bill. I hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Republican caucus.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce and the Subcommittee on Telecommunications for bringing this bill to the floor. As another Jesuit-educated Member of this institution, I take with great pride my colleagues in the institution who have had the honor of being so educated.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach this new millennium, we are in the midst of a communications revolution that we have all come to call the information age. Just look around this Capitol complex. Virtually every Member and staffer is making use of new technology to keep them in closer contact with the people that they represent.

It is not just here in the Capitol. Whether it is a cell phone attached to an ear, as we call home from the road, whether it is a pager that is buzzing on our hip to remind us of our next appointment or a vote here on the floor, or the laptop computers that we use, many at this very moment checking on their latest e-mail, more than 50 million Americans use some sort of mobile electronic communication service each and every day.

Mr. Chairman, Americans are using the new technology of the information age to keep pace with the unbelievable demands of daily life in America today. And our privacy laws that allow them to do so freely and securely must keep pace as well. We have come to expect that the things we do in our homes and the calls that we make on our telephones will not be the subject of arbitrary eavesdropping or illegal snooping. And it is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that this time-honored expectation prevails in America during this age of the information age.

Current technology is outpacing the law, so we need to modernize Federal law in order to meet the people's expectation of privacy. There are technology pirates who cruise the information highway in search of other people's private thoughts and secrets. Some do it as voyeurs and profiteers. Others do it to destroy their enemies. The reason is unimportant. What is important, however, is that this Congress respond and do so quickly.

The Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act that we are considering today will update the law to address the challenges of new technology and further strengthen penalties for those who choose to illegally intercept and divulge private conversations.

We have a responsibility to periodically update these Federal laws to maintain public confidence in new technology. And gray areas in current law affecting such things as digital phones, fax machines, pagers and computers demand that we act now.

In my mind there is no better example that exists for the need for protection against this kind of snooping than the illegal taping and distribution of a phone call, a cellular phone call between myself and some of my House colleagues last year. I made this call in December of 1996 using my wife's cell phone in her car during our Christmas vacation. While I spoke to several of my House colleagues, little did I know that my words and my expressions were being recorded and would end up as part of a public relations campaign to try to destroy the Speaker of this very House. The incident should prompt each of us to pause and to consider the importance of this legislation and this particular issue.

What are the American people to expect from technology pirates who step into the breach for illegal or immoral purposes? Today I speak from personal experience about the outrage and sense of powerlessness one feels when they learn that their expectation of privacy has been destroyed. The stakes are high in the battle for the law to keep pace with this new technology. If we fail to protect the American people's sense of privacy, if we fail to keep the door open to the next wave, we are actually shutting the door to the next wave of technological advances. We have closed the door on a key component of a brighter, more secure American future, and I do not think that is what any of us want to do.

The people's thirst for new gadgets and conveniences is tied to their belief that new technologies provide a basic level of security and privacy. If we stand by and allow the lawless and the obsessed to tape and reveal private words and comments, do we honestly expect the American people to trust and rely on this new wave of technology?

Mr. Chairman, it is time to bring the privacy laws of this Nation into the 21st century. I urge all my colleagues today to support this legislation and to send a strong and unequivocal message to all of those who would deny the American people some expectation of privacy with their wireless devices.

Our message should be plain and simple: If you violate someone's privacy, you are not creating idle mischief, you are breaking the law, and you will be brought to justice.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to come down here to the House to lend my support and approval for H.R. 2369, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act. For me and my congressional district and for the State of Florida, the key, important aspect of this bill is the change made to protect the needs of the amateur radio community and the needs of news organizations and others that rely on scanners to perform their duties.

As my colleagues know, my home State of Florida is slightly susceptible to natural disasters, and we are just now beginning to recover from the horrific tornado-driven storms from the past weekend. Without the aid of the amateur radio operators, Florida would suffer more during these disasters. The operators perform an invaluable service in helping coordinate disaster assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the countless individuals who dedicate their time and services in order to help their neighbors in times of emergencies. Therefore, I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for addressing their needs.

□ 1115

I strongly believe that this legislation will strengthen privacy in personal communications by allowing for the prosecution of either interception or divulgence of cellular and other radio communications, both analog and digital. This is a good bill. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for his effectiveness in this matter.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take a minute to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and his efforts at our subcommittee level indeed to make sure that our bill did not interfere with the rights of the legal standing community, the amateur radio operators who do assist dramatically in times of natural disaster. My home State of Louisiana as he knows was visited by Andrew as his was just a few years ago. We have a desperate need for the services. The work he did in our subcommittee to ensure that we did not interfere with those legitimate uses of scanners is an important aspect of this bill that I am very glad the gentleman highlighted today on the floor.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to again thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN)

for his excellent work on this legislation. It is going to, I think, be looked back at as a very important piece of legislation. As we move from 30 to 40 to 50 to 60 million Americans with cell phones and PCS phones, they will be grateful that this law is on the books.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), of course, on our side as well as all the others on our side. I would like to commend the staff: Whitney Fox; John Morabito; Tricia Paoletta, a Boston College graduate, I might add, Jesuit-trained; Mike O'Rielly, Andy Levin and David Schooler for their work on the legislation as well; on my staff to Colin Crowell who has worked on these privacy-related issues for the last 6 or 7 years, becoming one of the Nation's real experts on the subject, all of them necessary in order to put this legislation together.

By the way, Colin is also a graduate of Boston College and Jesuit trained, as a result reflecting these larger values I think in the spiritual and practical sense that Teilhard would have wanted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time with the hope that the Members will give unanimous support to this bill this morning.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, indeed to close this debate and to again thank all the members of the committee who participated in this effort. As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has done before me, let me add my thanks to the staff. He has done them all the honor of naming them personally. Let me concur in that, in that commendation to each one of you. The work of the staff has always been marvelous in terms of support for making sure this language is properly crafted and properly completed.

I also wanted to add to that thanks to the staff of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and particularly to Andy Levin who has been an important part of this legislation and to the gentleman from Michigan personally for his assistance in working with us as a team as we usually do on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications to craft good legislation for our country.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this is but a first effort. Members will see us again on this floor, I hope very soon, talking about privacy rights on the Internet and privacy rights for Americans in their health care records, in their financial records, in their financial transactions as they literally explore these new technologies in learning to communicate in commerce with one another a great deal more than even we know today. In that regard as we come to this floor, our effort will continue to again define and redefine and enlarge

the right of Americans to conduct their communications and their privacy transactions in a way that respects and enlarges upon that expectation of privacy.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, although I was unable to attend today's debate, I would like to voice my full support for H.R. 2369, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act. I believe that privacy is a fundamental right of all Americans. This bill secures privacy problems for all commercial cellular services, specialized radio devices and paging equipment. The bill requires the FCC to deny authorization to scanners that are equipped with decoders that could convert digital cellular, SMR's or PCS to analog voice, or convert paging to digital text. Please know that if I were able, I would have voted for the final passage of H.R. 2369.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, with thanks to all who participated in this effort, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act of 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. COMMERCE IN ELECTRONIC EAVES-DROPPING DEVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION.—Section 302(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "or modify any such device, equipment, or system in any manner that causes such device, equipment, or system to fail to comply with such regulations".

(b) PROHIBITION ON COMMERCE IN SCANNING RECEIVERS.—Section 302(d) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 302a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) EQUIPMENT AUTHORIZATION REGULATIONS.—

"(1) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations, and review and revise such regulations as necessary in response to subsequent changes in technology or behavior, denying equipment authorization (under part 15 of title 47, Code

of Federal Regulations, or any other part of that title) for any scanning receiver that is capable of—

"(A) receiving transmissions in the frequencies that are allocated to the domestic cellular radio telecommunications service or the personal communications service;

"(B) readily being altered to receive transmissions in such frequencies;

"(C) being equipped with decoders that—

"(i) convert digital domestic cellular radio telecommunications service, personal communications service, or protected specialized mobile radio service transmissions to analog voice audio; or

"(ii) convert protected paging service transmissions to alphanumeric text; or

"(D) being equipped with devices that otherwise decode encrypted radio transmissions for the purposes of unauthorized interception.

"(2) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR SHARED FREQUENCIES.—The Commission shall, with respect to scanning receivers capable of receiving transmissions in frequencies that are used by commercial mobile services and that are shared by public safety users, examine methods, and may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary, to enhance the privacy of users of such frequencies.

"(3) TAMPERING PREVENTION.—In prescribing regulations pursuant to paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider defining 'capable of readily being altered' to require scanning receivers to be manufactured in a manner that effectively precludes alteration of equipment features and functions as necessary to prevent commerce in devices that may be used unlawfully to intercept or divulge radio communication.

"(4) WARNING LABELS.—In prescribing regulations under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider requiring labels on scanning receivers warning of the prohibitions in Federal law on intentionally intercepting or divulging radio communications.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, the term 'protected' means secured by an electronic method that is not published or disclosed except to authorized users, as further defined by Commission regulation."

(c) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe amendments to its regulations for the purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. UNAUTHORIZED INTERCEPTION OR PUBLICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 705 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 605) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting "INTERCEPTION OR" after "UNAUTHORIZED";

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking "Except as authorized by chapter 119, title 18, United States Code, no person" and inserting "No person";

(3) in the second sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "intentionally" before "intercept"; and

(B) by striking "and divulge" and inserting "or divulge";

(4) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting the following: "Nothing in this subsection prohibits an

interception or disclosure of a communication as authorized by chapter 119 of title 18, United States Code.”;

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) by striking “fined not more than \$2,000 or”; and

(B) by inserting “or fined under title 18, United States Code,” after “6 months.”; and

(6) in subsection (e)(3), by striking “any violation” and inserting “any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation”;

(7) in subsection (e)(4), by striking “any other activity prohibited by subsection (a)” and inserting “any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation of subsection (a)”; and

(8) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following new paragraph:

“(7) Notwithstanding any other investigative or enforcement activities of any other Federal agency, the Commission shall investigate alleged violations of this section and may proceed to initiate action under section 503 of this Act to impose forfeiture penalties with respect to such violation upon conclusion of the Commission’s investigation.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CALVERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 377, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Hulshof
Ackerman	DeGette	Hunter
Aderholt	DeLauro	Hutchinson
Allen	DeLay	Hyde
Andrews	Deutsch	Inglis
Archer	Diaz-Balart	Istook
Armey	Dickey	Jackson (IL)
Bachus	Dicks	Jefferson
Baesler	Dingell	Jenkins
Baker	Dixon	John
Baldacci	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Ballenger	Dooley	Johnson (WI)
Barcia	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Dreier	Jones
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Kanjorski
Barrett (WI)	Dunn	Kaptur
Bartlett	Edwards	Kasich
Barton	Ehlers	Kelly
Bass	Ehrlich	Kennedy (MA)
Bateman	Emerson	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Engel	Kennelly
Bentsen	English	Kildee
Bereuter	Ensign	Kim
Berman	Eshoo	Kind (WI)
Berry	Etheridge	King (NY)
Billbray	Evans	Kingston
Billirakis	Everett	Kleczka
Bishop	Ewing	Klink
Blagojevich	Farr	Klug
Bliley	Fattah	Knollenberg
Blumenauer	Fawell	Kolbe
Blunt	Fazio	Kucinich
Boehert	Filner	LaFalce
Boehner	Foley	LaHood
Bonilla	Forbes	Lampson
Bonior	Ford	Lantos
Borski	Fossella	Largent
Boswell	Fowler	Latham
Boucher	Fox	LaTourette
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Lazio
Brady	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Brown (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Brown (FL)	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Brown (OH)	Furse	Lewis (GA)
Bryant	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Bunning	Ganske	Linder
Burr	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Burton	Gekas	Livingston
Buyer	Gephardt	LoBlundo
Callahan	Gibbons	Lowe
Calvert	Gilchrest	Lucas
Camp	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Campbell	Gilman	Maloney (NY)
Canady	Goode	Manton
Cannon	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Cardin	Goodling	Markey
Carson	Gordon	Martinez
Castle	Goss	Mascara
Chabot	Graham	Matsui
Chambliss	Granger	McCarthy (MO)
Chenoweth	Green	McCarthy (NY)
Christensen	Greenwood	McCollum
Clay	Gutierrez	McCrery
Clayton	Gutknecht	McDade
Clement	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McGovern
Coble	Hamilton	McHale
Coburn	Hansen	McHugh
Collins	Hastert	McInnis
Combest	Hastings (FL)	McIntosh
Condit	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Conyers	Hayworth	McKeon
Cook	Hefley	McKinney
Cooksey	Hefner	McNulty
Costello	Herger	Meehan
Cox	Hill	Meek (FL)
Coyne	Hilleary	Meeks (NY)
Cramer	Hilliard	Menendez
Crane	Hinchey	Metcalfe
Crapo	Hinojosa	Mica
Cubin	Hobson	Millender-
Cummings	Hoekstra	McDonald
Cunningham	Holden	Miller (CA)
Danner	Hooley	Miller (FL)
Davis (FL)	Horn	Minge
Davis (IL)	Hostettler	Mink
Davis (VA)	Hoyer	Moakley
Deal		Mollohan

Moran (KS)	Roemer	Stenholm
Moran (VA)	Rogan	Stokes
Morella	Rogers	Strickland
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Stump
Myrick	Rothman	Stupak
Nadler	Roukema	Sununu
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Talent
Nethercutt	Royce	Tanner
Neumann	Rush	Tauscher
Ney	Ryun	Tauzin
Northup	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Norwood	Salmon	Taylor (NC)
Nussle	Sanchez	Thomas
Oberstar	Sanders	Thompson
Obey	Sandlin	Thornberry
Oliver	Sanford	Thune
Ortiz	Sawyer	Thurman
Owens	Saxton	Tiahrt
Oxley	Scarborough	Tierney
Packard	Schaefer, Dan	Torres
Pallone	Schaffer, Bob	Towns
Pappas	Schumer	Trafilant
Parker	Scott	Turner
Pascarella	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Pastor	Serrano	Velazquez
Paxon	Sessions	Vento
Payne	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pease	Shaw	Walsh
Pelosi	Shays	Wamp
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Waters
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Watkins
Petri	Siskis	Watt (NC)
Pickering	Skaggs	Watts (OK)
Pickett	Skeen	Waxman
Pitts	Skelton	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Slaughter	Weldon (PA)
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	Weller
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wexler
Portman	Smith (OR)	Weygand
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	White
Pryce (OH)	Smith, Adam	Whitfield
Radanovich	Smith, Linda	Wicker
Rahall	Snowbarger	Wise
Ramstad	Snyder	Wolf
Rangel	Solomon	Woolsey
Redmond	Souder	Wynn
Regula	Spence	Yates
Reyes	Spratt	Young (AK)
Riggs	Stabenow	Young (FL)
Riley	Stark	
Rivers	Stearns	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Gonzalez	Kilpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen
Harman	Lofgren	Schiff
Houghton	Luther	Shimkus
Jackson-Lee	Poshard	
(TX)	Quinn	

□ 1144

Mr. KOLBE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 38, final passage of H.R. 2369, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on H.R. 2369 (rollcall No. 38). If I had been present, I would have voted “Aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 38, I was unavoidably detained at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 38 I was unavoidably detained at the White House because of an important announcement for Houston. Houstonian Colonel Eileen Collins was named the first woman commander of the Space Shuttle. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2369, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING PREPRINTING OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 1432, THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 1432. It is the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

The Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of March 9 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process to that bill, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on International Relations ordered this bill reported on June 25 and filed a report on March 2. The Committee on Ways and Means ordered the bill reported on February 25 and filed the report on March 2.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 11 a.m. this coming Tuesday, March 10, to the Committee on Rules at Room 312 in the Capitol. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has some tax code implications to it. The tax code implications are sprinkled throughout the bill, so we cannot just close one part of the bill dealing with the tax

code. That is why we have to ask for amendments to be filed. We will try to consider this as an open rule, except for those issues that affect the tax code, so Members should be aware of that and try to get their amendments filed by 11 a.m.

CHILD SUPPORT PERFORMANCE AND INCENTIVE ACT OF 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 378 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 378

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3130) to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for states that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. No amendment shall be in order unless printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Points of order against the amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 2 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 378 is a modified open rule providing for a fair and thorough debate of H.R. 3130, The Child Support Performance and Incentive Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Under the rule, any Member seeking to improve the bill by offering a germane amendment may do so. The only requirement is that their amendment be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Normally the Committee on Rules merely affords priority recognition to Members who preprint their amendments in the RECORD, but this rule requires it. That is because the underlying bill is very technical in nature.

For example, it establishes formulas under which States are penalized for noncompliance with Federal requirements. In addition, the bill represents a carefully negotiated agreement with the administration, and amendments to change the bill could compromise the broad support it has earned. Therefore, it is important that the Committee on Ways and Means is aware of any possible amendments to the bill.

The rule also waives points of order against the consideration of an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). Simply put, the Cardin amendment would deny visas to foreign nationals owing more than \$5,000 in child support payments. It also prohibits the naturalization of individuals who are not in compliance with child support orders.

In testimony to the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) explained that his amendment has bipartisan support among members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that the Committee on the Judiciary, which has primary jurisdiction over his amendment, has no objection to its consideration.

In an effort to speed up consideration of H.R. 3130, the rule will allow votes to be postponed and reduced to 5 minutes, if the postponed question follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, this rule provides for the customary motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues enthusiastically supported this legislation in 1988 and in 1996 that sought to

improve our Nation's system of collecting child support. The fact is that in many States the difference between what is owed in child support and what is actually collected amounts to millions, if not billions, of dollars, which never reach the children who are depending on it. If we want self-sufficiency to be a reality for many low-income single-parent families, we must do better.

In recognition of the Nation's poor record of enforcement, Congress instructed the States to establish statewide data systems to help track down deadbeat parents and make them pay. States were given Federal tax dollars to set up these systems, and it is incumbent upon them to do so. However, some States have not been able to meet the Federal standards and deadlines, and as a result, they are facing very significant penalties. No one is suggesting that penalties are inappropriate. The question is whether the punishment matches the crime.

Under current law, the penalties are stiff. States that did not meet the October 1 deadline last year are at risk of losing their Federal child support money, as well as their entire welfare block grant. This type of penalty does not just scold States, it threatens to decimate their entire child support program.

I think the gentleman from Florida (Chairman SHAW) said these penalties are the equivalent of issuing the death penalty for stealing a loaf of bread. My State of Ohio offers a good example of why H.R. 3130 is necessary.

Ohio had installed its statewide child support enforcement network in all 88 of our counties in advance of the designated deadline. In Ohio's view, the State was in compliance. However, since Ohio had not entered the data into the system, HHS considered them in violation of Federal requirements. As a result, Ohio was threatened with losing its Federal child support money, as well as the State's entire 728 million TANF block grant.

In my mind, that is an excessive penalty that does not square with congressional intent, gives no consideration to the good-faith effort Ohio and other States have made to achieve the Herculean task of setting up statewide systems, and more importantly, it does nothing to help Ohio's children, who are in desperate need of their parents' financial support.

H.R. 3130 will move us toward a more reasonable policy that will give States a strong incentive to get their child support programs up to speed, without letting them off the hook for unacceptable delays. Under this bill, Ohio still loses about \$1.1 million, and faces additional penalties if they do not have their systems up and running by October of this year. This penalty is real, and the threat of additional fines is sufficient to encourage Ohio and other

States into quick compliance without compromising the State's ability to meet the needs of children and families.

The gentleman from Florida (Chairman SHAW) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) deserve congratulations for their good work on this bill, which addresses a real and immediate problem with a fair, bipartisan solution.

In the interests of children across the Nation who are waiting for their parents to give them the support they deserve, I urge every Member to vote yes on the rule and yes on this common-sense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified open rule. It will allow for a fair debate on H.R. 3130. As my colleague has described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate. That will be equally divided between the majority and the minority.

Under this rule, only amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be in order. The rule also waives points of order against an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

In 1988, Congress passed a law that required States to computerize their systems to monitor enforcement of child support payments. Any State that failed to meet this deadline for making the change would lose substantial Federal benefits. Apparently what has happened is fewer than half the States really met the deadline as of October 1, 1997.

This bill recognizes the difficulty in meeting the deadline. It creates less severe penalties for States that make a good-faith effort to meet the requirements. The bill also creates new incentives for the States to improve the effectiveness of their child support programs. The Committee on Rules approved the rule by voice vote, and it had support on both sides of the aisle. I would urge adoption of the rule.

□ 1200

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, it appears, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 378 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3130.

The Chair designates the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) to assume the chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3130) to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, with Mr. CAMP (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, a sledge hammer now hangs over the States. Because of bipartisan legislation enacted back in 1988, States that violated the deadline for establishing good computer systems in their child support enforcement programs will lose all of their child support funds and, eventually, all of their funds in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant, that is TANF. Here is an idea of how huge these penalties are: In California, they would amount to \$4 billion a year; Michigan would be \$880 million; in Pennsylvania, \$800 million; in Illinois, \$650 million.

Penalties of this magnitude are devastating and would cripple both the child support and the welfare programs being run by those States. Then everyone would lose: the Federal Government, State government, and families and children, most of them poor.

What we need is a new penalty that will be serious enough to motivate the States to do the right thing, yet moderate enough not to cripple the States' programs. This is exactly what this bill does.

Specifically, under this bill non-compliant States will lose 4 percent of their child support money but none of their TANF welfare money the first year they are out of compliance; 8 percent the second year they are out of compliance; 16 percent the third; and 20 percent for the fourth and subsequent years.

To give an idea of the impact of this bill, consider the following comparisons: California would be penalized \$11

million, not \$4 billion. Michigan would be penalized \$4 million, not \$880 million. Pennsylvania would be penalized \$3 million, not \$800 million. Illinois will be penalized \$3 million, not \$650 million.

Yes, the penalties under this bill are moderate compared to those of current law. But no Member would think that they are weak. When this bill is enacted, at least 16 States will pay penalties that total about \$30 million. This amount is greater than all the child support penalties imposed against States in this program for the previous decade.

At the request of several States and Members of this body, we also included a waiver procedure in this bill that gives States some flexibility in how they can fulfill the most important computer requirement in Federal child support legislation, creating a computer system that links all the counties and cities of the States together in a common system. The General Accounting Office assures us that the technology to link together computer systems that operate on different software is now readily available, so we should allow the States to use this technology and then help them to pay for it.

But our provision is carefully drafted to ensure that the linked systems perform efficiently and that the Secretary has adequate information and authority to disallow systems that are not adequate.

The most important feature of this bill is that we have worked for nearly 5 months to build a bipartisan, bicameral approach that is supported by the administration, the States, and child advocates. And here I have to compliment the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), my esteemed colleague. The gentleman and his staff have contributed greatly, at least as much to this bill as the majority. The gentleman from Michigan has repeatedly helped us to find the middle ground between competing forces that tried to move the penalties towards the extremes. Thanks in large part to the gentleman and the members of his subcommittee, this bill has found that magic place along the continuum of penalties that allows all sides to support our bipartisan approach.

Thus, it is not surprising that this bill enjoys nearly universal support. All sides support the bill because it represents the middle ground between severe penalties that will cripple the States and moderate penalties that will motivate the States to do the right thing.

In addition to a few minor and technical provisions, the bill also contains a very useful reform of the Nation's child support incentive program. Under current law, generous child support incentives are paid to States that conduct inefficient child support pro-

grams. More than half the money is now given away without any regard to the programs's efficiency. Under the system created by this bill, States will receive incentive payments only for effective performance.

Virtually everyone who has studied the new system has concluded that it would lead to improvements in child support performance by the States. The House enacted this reform last year, but the Senate failed to take it up, so we are going to send it back to them once again.

The heart of this bill is the penalty provision. It is fair, it is tough, and it enjoys nearly universal support. So let us now move quickly to enact this bill and to impose serious but not crippling fines on States that have failed to build effective computer systems. If we take this action, I can virtually assure the Members that within a year all but one or two States will have their systems and will meet all the Federal requirements. More importantly, we will have taken yet another step towards creating a child support system that ensures that children get the financial support they need and deserve.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I am proud to be cosponsor with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), chairman of the committee, on this legislation.

This Congress has been at this problem for a decade, and we are talking here about the children of America and children who are in great need. We made some progress in the last 10 years. Support orders have become more numerous and they have become more enforced. But it remains this today: About half of the children where there is a separation and a divorce in most cases do not have a support order. And in the half of the cases where they do, there is not in many of them full compliance with that order.

Madam Chairman, this is an essential part of our effort to provide strength, support within the family where there is need. The gentleman from Florida and his staff have worked endlessly with our staff and with the administration, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Shaw-Levin bill on child support.

Madam Chairman, I want to emphasize that I think this is a tough bill. The earlier legislation had penalties that essentially were never going to be implemented. And penalties that are so far off the chart that they will never happen are really not penalties.

What the gentleman from Florida and I and others have done here is to replace penalties that were not enforceable with penalties that indeed, as the gentleman has said, are going to be implemented. The States that have not met the deadline are going to pay a re-

alistic price, and the gentleman has outlined how they will be implemented, starting with 4 percent of the child support administrative funds.

We do allow an alternative where States have counties which have developed elaborate systems and effective systems, those States where they can piece together a system so it is fully integrated as if it were a single system can ask HHS for a waiver. That authority is within HHS. And all States must be forewarned if they are going to ask for a waiver, they have to come up with a system that is going to be as efficient, as quick, as subject to complete implementation as if there were a single integrated system.

We also provide in this bill for an incentive system that will truly work, based, as the gentleman from Florida said, on five elements: the degree of paternity establishment, the establishment of support orders, collections on those orders, collections on arrearages, and cost-effectiveness.

So this is an important day for tens of thousands of kids of America. What we are doing here on a bipartisan basis is to say to them, the States shall meet their responsibility. We gave hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury so the States would implement a system that was faithful to the children who were supposed to be protected. And now, within a reasonably short period of time, every support order is going to be, hopefully, implemented within a State and across State lines.

So, again, I want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and to the staff, as well as to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) who is also on the committee, to all of my Democratic colleagues on Ways and Means, and to the staff and the administration, a job well done. We are going to be busy on the other side of the roundtable to see that this time what we pass will become law.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a hard-working member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for yielding me this time, and for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for his efforts, as well.

Madam Chairman, the bill before us today, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act, is important to our Nation's children for two major reasons.

First, our legislation says that Federal incentive payments to the States for child support should be based on good performance. The better a State does at collecting child support for our

children, the more they will get in incentive payments.

Regrettably, our current system does not base payments on how well the State actually performs at child support collection. It is time we changed this, and we are doing it in a bipartisan and careful manner, working with child advocates, with the administration and experts from the States and local communities.

Second, our bill will help States develop better computer systems that can accurately and efficiently manage State child support programs. These computers play a vital role in helping States collect child support for children. Many States, 32, in fact, have not met the deadlines Congress set in 1988 and there are plenty of reasons why.

Partly, in 1988 no one had any idea about how the world of computers would look a decade later. The personal computer on my desk today is as powerful as many statewide computer systems were back in 1988. These things have changed dramatically in the last 10 years, and States rightfully want some flexibility in how those requirements are enforced.

Madam Chairman, we need to continue building a strong and effective child support system. Whether for families leaving welfare or single parents struggling to get by, our bill is crucial to America's children so they can start getting the support they need and deserve.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), my colleague and friend who has worked hard on this issue.

□ 1215

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me. I would like to commend both the gentleman from Michigan and gentleman from Florida, chairman of committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee. They have done an outstanding job in putting together a bipartisan consensus. I truly appreciate their efforts and the fact that they showed a great deal of sensitivity to some of the States, obviously like Michigan, but particularly a State like California.

It was obvious that the penalties that were imposed some 10, 12 years ago were much too stringent. To take away all of the AFDC monies for the failure of creating the incentive program, it just was not a realistic penalty suggestion. As a result of that, everybody, including the State of California, knew that enforcement would not occur. But this is a realistic proposal. This is one in which I believe it is incumbent upon the States, particularly the State of California, to comply with.

Back in the mid-1960s, Sacramento County, my county, actually had a

child support enforcement section of the Sacramento County DA's department. That was being run at that time by an attorney Virginia Mueller, who was a Cornell graduate. We have had great success in Sacramento County. But in the State of California today, unfortunately, in all 58 counties we have a performance rate of 14 percent, absolutely shameful.

I have to say that this is just the other side of the welfare reform bill that was passed last year. Last year we were focusing on the custodial parent, usually the mother with minor children. This year we will be focusing on the noncustodial parent, usually an able-bodied male who may have another family and is disregarding the requirements and obligations that he had to his other family, the family that is now impoverished. As a result of that, we need to do a better job. This bill will go a long way in doing that.

I want to just conclude by making one further observation. I mentioned California's performance rate is 14 percent. It is outrageous, and it is one in which I believe that if we could get it up to 50 or 60 percent, we could actually eliminate a lot of the TANF payments and probably eliminate a lot of the taxpayer burden on welfare payments. So I will not under any circumstances in the next 3 or 4 years support any effort by California to seek a further waiver, further extension of the penalties. I think these penalties are reasonable, and the State of California with the technological know-how we have should not have any problem integrating all 57 counties in order to make a system that collects payments from anybody throughout the State of California.

I want to urge strong support for this legislation, and hopefully we will be able to work with the other body in order to move this legislation before we adjourn.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill and would like to commend my colleague from Florida, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for bringing this to the floor today.

One of the most universally supported efforts in the welfare reforms we enacted 2 years ago were provisions to get tough on so-called deadbeat parents, parents who bring children into this world and then wash their hands of all responsibility for them. This scourge has been one of the saddest reasons why so many people, mostly women, have been trapped in the welfare system, dependent on government to help raise children because the fathers of those children have offered no help.

We enacted provisions to curb this negligence within a welfare reform

package entitled the Personal Responsibility Act. I repeat that, because that is the substance of this debate, personal responsibility, accepting responsibilities for bringing a child into this world and then accepting the responsibility to pay for them and care for them.

Nowhere does that name better apply than forcing those who bring children into this world to take personal responsibility for their support. This bill modifies the penalties contained in those reforms as well as the Family Support Act of 1988, not to weaken the provisions, but to ensure that they can be realistically met.

The current penalties for failure by States to meet data processing and collection requirements are severe, the loss not only of the State share of Federal child support funds, but the State's temporary assistance for needy families block grants. Clearly we will only compound the problems of those struggling to get off welfare if we penalize States so severely that they are financially crippled and unable to continue their reform efforts. This bill rectifies that by imposing penalties as incentives to meet child support program requirements, but without dealing these States such a blow that they cannot possibly meet those requirements at all.

Again, I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for offering this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I join my colleagues in the California delegation in supporting H.R. 3130. It would be truly tragic if we allowed any child in California to be penalized for the State's inability to implement a statewide computerized child support collection system. But even if we are successful today in our efforts to keep California's welfare dollars, we will be doing absolutely nothing to force deadbeat parents to live up to their responsibilities or to help a single child out of poverty. The only way we are going to increase the rate of child support collection in California, which is currently an abysmal 14 or even 13 percent, some say, of court-ordered amounts, and across the Nation, is to make child support collection a Federal matter.

That is why the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and I have introduced H.R. 2189, the Uniform Child Support Enforcement Act. This bill would use existing national computer systems to collect and distribute child support. Not only would collection go up dramatically, but welfare would go down to the same degree. We would not be wasting any more time or money trying to fix a doomed State-by-State, county-by-county computer system.

Kids in California, children across the country should not have to wait

any longer to get the child support they deserve. From the ashes of California's computer meltdown, let us bring to life a Federal system to make sure that every child support check is truly in the mail.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3130, legislation that will improve child support collection efforts and at the same time save many States from facing a draconian penalty. H.R. 3130 builds on the child support provisions that were included in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act that completely revamped our welfare system. Our new welfare laws ensure that children receive the support that they are due on time and in full by achieving three major goals: By establishing uniform State tracking procedures, by taking strong measures to establish paternity, and funding and ensuring tough child support enforcement.

Our new welfare laws enable States to track deadbeat dads who flee across State lines. States will now have directories of new hires with information used to establish paternity, modify and enforce support orders and reduce fraud, and at the same time State information is now being transmitted to the Federal Parent Locator Service for data matched with other States.

Cracking down on deadbeat dads has been a priority. Our commitment is strengthened even further through the legislation we are voting on today. We need to recognize under a 1988 law, States face the termination of almost all of their welfare funding if they fail to meet certain deadlines, including October 31 of this year, to implement automated data processing systems for child support collections. This devastating penalty will occur in at least 16 States under current law, including my home State of Pennsylvania, if this legislation is not passed.

Let us recognize, H.R. 3130 in no way lets States off the hook. Too often in the past Congress has enacted laws that threaten to penalize States for failing to meet Federal requirements, but backed down when it came time to follow through. Today we are not doing that. This bill strikes the right balance by penalizing States that miss the deadline for establishing effective computer systems while ensuring that these penalties are legitimate and balanced and do not hurt the very children we are trying to help.

In my view, the bipartisan Child Support Performance and Incentive Act before us today protects children by improving child support payment requirements and at the same time protects

States by creating an alternative penalty system.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the most distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY).

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for bringing this most important legislation to the floor today. We all talk about child support, the need for child support, the importance of child support. But what we are doing today is going one step closer to making the rhetoric into fact and doing something about child support enforcement.

When we passed welfare reform 2 years ago, many of us fought to include improvements to our child support system. The legislation before us today makes good on one of those promises by revamping the current formula for the Federal incentive payments given to States for running effective child support systems. The measure would provide incentive payments to States based on five criteria of performance: establishing paternity, establishing child support orders, collecting current child support, collecting past due child support, and administering cost-effective child support enforcement systems.

In other words, the bill clearly encourages States to take all the necessary steps to make sure both parents share in the financial responsibility of supporting the children that are their children.

The legislation also revises the penalty on States that have not met the Federal deadline for having a computerized child support system. Establishing, tracking and enforcing child support orders is much more difficult when State caseworkers have to go back again, find out where the files are, go through file boxes to find those files. We have come into the computer age. There is no reason why the child support enforcement system should not be in the computer system.

The bill therefore requires States to pay a modest penalty for failing to meet a 10-year old automation requirement. I should point out that the Federal Government paid States a 90 percent match to fulfill this mandate. The original deadline elapsed 2½ years ago. So I do not think the bill requires States to meet an unreasonable timetable.

Madam Chairman, better child support enforcement means fewer families on welfare, an improved standard of living. I have worked on this situation for years. I know that it is very difficult to get it on the front burner of people's lives, but I am telling my colleagues, this bill will help children, and it is a very good bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Florida. I want to, first of all, say that I have the highest respect for the gentlemen from Michigan and Florida and congratulate them on this effort. I will support this bill. I toyed with frankly opposing the bill, but after discussing it with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and knowing of the concerns of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), I am going to support this bill. I think it is a reasonable, rational thing probably to do.

I think that we are sincere in doing this, and we are trying to do something that will not harm children while at the same time continuing incentives in place.

Madam Chairman, the States have had 10 years to get their computer systems together. Yet here they are asking Congress not only for an extension, but while we are at it, could we throw in reduced penalties, too. In talking to my very distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) who sits on this committee, I think we are correct in reducing these penalties. My own State very frankly, Madam Chairman, is concerned about this bill and perhaps would not like to see it passed, and do not want any penalties. I do not share the view of my State on this issue.

I have practiced law for over a quarter of a century. I practiced in the courts of Prince George's County in Maryland. I handled a lot of domestic cases in that process and sat in the courtroom not only with my own clients, but watched other nonsupport cases come before the courts. I saw time after time after time a wink and a nod at parents who did not meet their responsibilities, who did not support their children, who had children, thought it was a spectator sport and thought they would pass the cost on to the rest of us.

□ 1230

That was despicable and is despicable. God gives us a great blessing when he gives us children and we ought to take the responsibility to ensure that they are fed and housed and clothed properly. There are too many Americans who do not do that. This ought to be a priority item for every State and for every administrator to make sure that child support is collected. Far too little of it is collected now. It is not that I resent sharing in the costs to help those children in need. None of us begrudge them the help. But all of us, I think, ought to be and are angry at those parents who can but do not support their children. In an age of computers and information technology, we ought to be capable of identifying and going after those who owe their children, not just society but their children the responsibility that parenthood places upon them.

Again, Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for their leadership on this issue. It is obvious that we have a practical problem, it is obvious that we want to go ahead, and it is obvious that we continue to keep in effect incentives to get on line so that we will get at deadbeat parents.

I thank the Chair for her not tapping the gavel as soon as she might otherwise have done. This is an important issue, not just this bill, but we need to as a Congress and as a Nation focus on enforcing and expecting responsibility of parents towards their children.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for a very fine statement. He has put his finger on what we need to attack next, and, that is, the disintegration of the American family. What we have seen from the 1960s to date, much of it was caused by a failed welfare system, but we are trying to correct many of those things. Now we have to go back and teach parental responsibility. The problem that we have, we have got so many of these young adults that are having kids, some of them kids themselves who are having children who have never even lived in a home where there was a male figure. It is disgraceful where this country has gone with the disintegration of the American family. I might say that the next piece of the puzzle in welfare reform is to reverse this trend and go back to the real principles. When we say family values, it should be more than just a political cliché. It should have some real meat to it and something that we all believe in and let us put the emphasis on the family. I compliment the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for those remarks.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I thank him for his work. I agree that all of us together need to heighten expectations. I frankly think what happened in the 1970s, in the 1960s in particular was that we lowered expectations of performance of ourselves and of others and somehow society did not feel it incumbent upon them to hold others accountable for that which they ought to be responsible for. I think this is one example, but it is a broader example than that. I frankly think under the gentleman's leadership, frankly I think under President Clinton's leadership in terms of talking about responsibility which he talked about in 1992 and which we followed through in this Congress, I think we are seeing much better performance, but we need to do much more. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his leadership.

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, I would also add, in talking about our expectations, people will generally not rise above our expectations of them. Clearly under the welfare reform bill, now under this bill as the effect that it is going to have on fathers all over this country who are not meeting their obligations, it is going to raise the expectations and require certain things that were not required before and that were really just sloughed off. Those days are behind us, thank goodness, and I think we are on the way to putting back together the American family.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill with reservations, which I will state.

This legislation is intended to encourage the remaining states and territories to comply with child support enforcement computer guidelines set in 1988.

The states have had ten years to get their computer systems together. Yet here they are, asking Congress not only for an extension, but, while we're at it, could we throw in reduced penalties too?

Incredibly, there are still 14 states and two territories that have yet to comply, including my own state of Maryland.

A substantial number of children will be adversely affected if we do not make these changes. That is something that no one wants to do.

This is tragic. Congress is, in effect, rewarding the states for their delinquency. We are sending the wrong message to deadbeat parents and their children.

However, Madam Chairman, we are reminded once again that, in the past, child support enforcement was a low priority in this country. We cannot and should not send the wrong message to deadbeat parents that failure to pay child support is acceptable. They are not excused by Congress or any other government function of their responsibilities to their children. We must be careful not to forgive passive neglect.

In my own legislative efforts to crack down on deadbeat parents, I say "you can run but you can't hide!" This legislation says "you can run, you can hide, and eventually you will be caught, but not for a little while longer."

Any extension provided for non-compliant states and territories prolongs the time that children must wait for badly needed support.

I will vote in favor of this bill for the children, who need assistance sooner rather than later.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, an amendment to H.R. 3130, if that could be called up.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would tell the gentleman that we are still in general debate. We are, I think, about to conclude the general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may discuss his amendment at this time, he just may not offer it.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 3130, the Child Support Perform-

ance and Incentive Act, which would have included the cost of child care in child support payments to custodial parents who are currently employed or are active seeking employment. I recognize that some States around our Nation are already doing this and I applaud their efforts. However, many States in our Nation are not. It is these States that that amendment would have been targeted. It was the intent of my amendment to split the costs of child care proportionately between the custodial and noncustodial parent, not to separate child care and child care support payments.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has agreed to work with me in conference to include language which would express the true intent of my amendment that child care expenses be a factor in determining child care support payments.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I agree with the gentleman that we are going to continue to work with him. We know of his concern in this area and we know of the value of his intentions. We will do what we can to work with the gentleman during the conference process and even afterwards if it is not included in the final product.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with us on this proposal and I look forward to working with him in conference.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, let me acknowledge both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for this very forthright and straightforward legislation. In formulating and organizing the Congressional Childrens Caucus in this congressional term as I have gone around my district and other places, one of the rising cries that I hear are from struggling single parents want to do the right thing. They always ask how can they be helped to do the right thing. One of the ways that we have tried to help in the Congressional Childrens Caucus is by promoting children as a national agenda. Child support is more than the moneys distributed to someone to do something with. Child support is dignity. It brings down the entitlement to do things that are not right for both the parent who is struggling and the child. You notice I say parent, because this is something that happens to males and females. In my own State of Texas, this is a good bill, for I want to see them get a system that responds to all the parents who are in many instances working parents

struggling to raise many children. In fact, we find that half of the 18.7 million children living in single parent families in 1994 were poor; 70 percent of African-American children growing up in a single parent household lived at below the poverty line compared to about one of every 10 children in two-parent families. The system is broken and this particular legislation in fact provides sort of a guiding line, an incentive to get your act together, and if you do not, within a year's time, you will see the moneys that you would hope to have gotten from the Federal Government starting to eke out. I think this is important, because we must support our children. Unfortunately, only 21 States and Guam have met the October 1, 1997 deadline. I think it is important that the Committee on Ways and Means in their wisdom has seen the value of making sure that we have a way of supporting our children.

Madam Chairman, let me say that our most important treasure in this Nation, and I thank you for your kindness, is and are our children. My English teacher would want me to get one of those correct. But I say that so that we know children as well make mistakes, but the mistake that we do not want to make is to leave them outside in the cold. This is an excellent bill, I offer my support, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998. Child support is an issue critical to the well-being of our nation's children. In 1994, one in every four children lived in a family with only one parent present in the home. Half of all children spend a portion of their childhoods in single-parent homes. While these figures are striking in their own right, we cannot begin to truly understand their impact on our nation's children without considering the fact that half of the 18.7 million children living in single-parent families in 1994 were poor, and 70 percent of African American children growing up in a single parent household, lived at or below the poverty line, compared with about one of every 10 children in two-parent families.

Many children in single-parent families rely on child support to keep them from poverty, but in doing so they rely on a child support system that is broken and has for years failed our nation's children. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, 31 million American children are currently owed more than \$41 billion in unpaid child support. Only 20 percent of child support cases resulted in collections in 1996, even though taxpayers spent \$2.24 billion per year on public child support enforcement. These statistics reflect a child support system in need of our attention and in need of reform. H.R. 3130 is an important first step in that direction.

The Family Support Act of 1988 set a deadline for all states to have in operation a fully-automated data processing system to assist in administering their child support enforcement systems. Only 21 states and Guam met the

October 1, 1997 deadline. Those states not meeting the deadline—including California, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and my home state of Texas—face extremely severe penalties under current law. They are confronted with the possibility of losing both their federal child support funding and all of their federal welfare assistance funding provided by the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act block grant. This obviously benefits no one and, in fact, threatens to punish those very people the original law was intended to protect—young children and single parent families.

Current law has also been criticized for not actually rewarding states for their performance in child support enforcement. The federal government spends nearly \$500 million a year on child support incentive payments to states—but more than half of those funds are awarded to states without regard to how they actually perform in child support enforcement.

H.R. 3130 provides an answer to those concerns by establishing a new alternative penalty for states that failed to meet last October's deadline. The bill provides that a state that makes a good faith effort to comply with the data processing requirements of the Family Support Act of 1988 could avoid the penalty required under current law and instead qualify for an alternative penalty provided that the state submits a plan to the Department of Health and Human Services specifying how, by what date, and at what cost it will comply with the data processing requirement.

H.R. 3130 also creates a new federal incentive system to reward states with effective child support enforcement programs. This new system is intended to ensure that more of these federal funds are given to the states based on the states' actual performance in child support enforcement.

H.R. 3130 is an important step in mending a child support enforcement system that is now quite damaged. It is the result of bipartisan action and cooperation and I commend the work of all involved in bringing it before us this afternoon. I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this important legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3130. I want to tell Members a bit about the research that I did prior to the vote on this measure. I went to the State of North Dakota and evaluated their efforts to bring the new system of child support collection on line. I was terribly concerned that passage of this measure might somehow signal that quickly bringing more rigorous child enforced collection procedures on line would be set back by this legislation. I became convinced of the contrary. North Dakota is making great strides toward meeting the new standards. However, we are not going to meet the deadline. Collections are increasing. We are on track to have an optimal system on line by this summer. If we do not pass this bill, North Dakota will be substantially financially penalized.

The resources put into bringing us on line and upgrading our systems will be diverted into dealing with the consequences of the existing penalty. In other words, existing law is not serving a constructive purpose. This law will serve the constructive purpose of encouraging States, like the one I represent, to step up child support collection and to bring these new systems on line as quickly as possible. I commend the State employees in North Dakota that are working so hard to get us there and appreciate very much the Committee on Ways and Means bringing this bill forward.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I support the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act, a bill which would ensure that children and families will not be unnecessarily punished in states still working on establishing database systems required under the Family Support Act of 1988.

Under the current law, 42,182 children in the District of Columbia could lose vital assistance through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. And the District is not alone. Because of the complexities involved in establishing these database systems, 29 states including several large states such as California, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania, were unable to meet an extended deadline under the old law.

The alternative penalties that have been developed in this bill will reward the states that have met the statutory deadline of setting up a database system without unduly punishing the children of our country living in the majority of the states and the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998. This bill builds upon the historic welfare reform legislation that became law two years ago and is proof positive of Republicans' long standing commitment to welfare reform.

As Chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, two years ago I worked in tandem with Mr. SHAW, the Chairman of the Ways and Means, Human Resources Subcommittee to deliver a sweeping welfare reform package—a package that truly empowers people to lead more successful and more fulfilling lives.

As Republicans, we know that we must attack hopelessness and poverty on several fronts. That is why, the work of our Committee coupled with the efforts of Mr. SHAW's, represented a comprehensive approach to the war on poverty. We poured more money into child care; toughened up the child protection grant; created real work requirements to spur more people to work; and gave States and locals greater flexibility to successfully run their child nutrition programs and State welfare programs.

The phenomenal and unexpected rapid decline in the welfare roles points to the success of our approach.

However, Republicans' commitment to protecting children and improving the welfare system did not end in 1996.

We have continued to monitor the implementation of welfare reform to make sure that it is successfully implemented. That is why

since the passage of the Welfare reform law, you have seen dramatic improvements in the areas child protection, adoption and foster care signed into law.

The bill we have before us today is just another step to making sure we continue to give States and local governments what they need to get struggling families back on their feet.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3130.

Mr. QUINN. Madam Chairman I would also like to voice my full support for H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance And Incentive Act. This bill focuses on States' efforts to convert their child support data collection and enforcement efforts from employee-dependent to automated, computer-based systems. One sure way that Welfare Reform will work is to ensure parents with custodial children that they will receive child support payments from non-custodial parents on a regular basis. H.R. 3130 gives States' a revised penalty structure which fail to comply with deadlines to automate their child support enforcement programs. Please know that if I were able, I would have voted for final passage of H.R. 3130.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998, which is of critical importance to the children of Illinois. I am pleased the House of Representatives is acting quickly on this legislation which strikes the right balance between encouraging states to modernize their child support systems without penalizing the very children the law is designed to help.

While we want to ensure that states have the most efficient mechanism in place to collect and distribute child support payments to families in need, we must also make certain that the penalties for failure to meet the federal deadlines are not so extreme as to jeopardize funding intended for those same children. My own state of Illinois did not meet the deadline established by the 1988 Family Support Act and if this legislation is not approved today, Illinois will be forced to forfeit \$650 million in federal funding for child support services. Child support programs provide vital assistance in locating parents, establishing paternity and collecting child support payments and a large penalty, such as the one facing Illinois, is extreme and serves only to hurt those we seek to help.

The bill before us would still impose a penalty of almost \$3 million on Illinois but by reducing the penalty and restoring funding for these programs, we can be certain efforts in Illinois will continue to ensure that more deadbeat parents are located and made accountable. After all, collecting financial support from parents is what this effort is all about. As the father of eight children, I find it personally repugnant that so many parents are unwilling to face their responsibility voluntarily and the federal government is forced to continually address the issue of child support enforcement.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of our children and continuing our efforts to stop irresponsible parents from following cowardly paths of denying their children the financial support they deserve.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of

1998. This bill sets forth an alternative penalty structure for states that did not complete their statewide child support computer systems by the deadline.

Under current law, states like my home State of Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Ohio stand to lose all of their child support enforcement funding plus the states entire Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. Such a loss would be devastating to millions of children and adults and undermine welfare reform efforts underway in the various states. Child support enforcement is a vital component of any welfare reform plan and efforts to cut any funds for enforcement could hurt those who need the help the most.

The alternative penalty structure in this bill is fairer and more reasonable than current law. This bill recognizes states' good faith efforts to complete their systems and targets federal child support enforcement dollars only. However, this bill provides real incentives for states that actually do a better job at child support enforcement. Such inducements provided by this bill gives a real glimmer of hope that those children seeking assistance, whether in Illinois or any other state will in fact secure the support they need.

Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Thank you.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act, which would reduce the financial sanctions imposed on states that have not established a statewide computer system by October 1, 1997 to enforce child support payments, and increase financial rewards for those states that effectively enforce child support orders. As amended, this legislation would deny visas and entry to noncustodial parents who are foreign nationals owing more than \$5,000 in child support in this nation, and require state courts, cases involving non-amicable divorces, to include child care costs in their calculations when calculating the amount of child support payments a non-custodial parent must make.

This bipartisan legislation is not an attempt to allow deadbeat dads the opportunity to escape their child support payments, but rather it provides an alternative penalty procedure for states that fail to meet federal child support data processing requirements. This legislation would reform federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, rewarding those states with respect to their performance in paternity establishment and child support order enforcement, including cost-effectiveness.

The Family Support Act of 1988 set a deadline of October 1, 1995, for all states to have in operation a fully-automated data processing system to assist in administering their child support enforcement systems. Most states, however, were unable to meet this deadline because federal regulations specifying the requirements for the data processing system were issued late, and because of the complexities involved in establishing such systems. With the enactment of PL 104-35, Congress extended the deadline for two years, until October 1, 1997.

The state of North Carolina is in full compliance with the October 1st deadline. The State

has implemented its statewide automated data processing system for child support enforcement, and has been certified by the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). While the State's plan was submitted to Health and Human Services prior to the October 1, 1997 deadline, the necessary site visit and administrative action by HHS was not completed until January 1998. North Carolina is one of fifteen states that will benefit from this bill's provision to allow HHS to waive any penalties for states that have done the necessary work but which were not certified by the October deadline.

For those states that did not meet the October 1, 1997 deadline, this legislation is not just a slap on the wrist. This legislation provides severe financial penalties including: loss of federal child support funding and their federal welfare assistance funding provided by the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant.

We must demand parents live up to their responsibilities to their children. H.R. 3130, with the inclusion of the Cardin and Gilman amendments, effectively addresses state issues, as well as enhances the current web of tools available to enforce child support orders.

Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 3130, as amended. It sends a strong message to states and parents that child support enforcement is vitally important, and I am pleased to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging its passage.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I rise in support of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act. Under current law, 16 states, including my state of Illinois, are facing very severe penalties for failing to complete a statewide child support computer system by October 1, 1997. These states stand to lose their entire TANF Block Grant and their federal child support funding. If these penalties were to stand, the states' welfare programs would be completely jeopardized, and many people could be left without their benefits. This bill restructures the penalty system in a way that will encourage states to get their systems up and running as soon as possible. The bill will increase the penalty for each year that states fail to comply, thereby giving them more incentive to get their programs on-line quickly. Everybody agrees that it is important to have an efficient statewide system to enforce child support payments.

The bill also restructures the Child Support Incentive system. This program awards almost a half billion dollars per year to the States. This bill would make the incentive program based on performance measures such as: paternity establishment, collections on current payments and cost effectiveness. In order to qualify for this funding states would have to show that their child support program is successful—and that's what this is all about.

Payment of child support is everyone's goal, and I believe this bill will help states in their efforts to do so. I appreciate the hard work of Chairmen SHAW and ARCHER on this bipartisan bill, and urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment introduced by my colleague from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN. My only regret is that I did not introduce this amendment first.

The Cardin amendment is desperately needed to combat the ever growing problem of deadbeat parents fleeing the country to avoid child support orders. The Cardin amendment will deny visas and entry into the United States to foreign nationals and legal residents who are noncustodial parents owing more than \$5,000 in child support payments in the United States. It also provides federal immigration officers with the authority to serve summons, court orders and other legal process in child support cases at the border. In this day of growing free trade and less border restrictions, this amendment will raise the importance of payment of child support beyond state borders.

Madam Chairman, I have a situation in my district where a hard working mother has been actively seeking the payment of child support arrears. However, the father has fled the country. He now operates an airline out of a Central American country and regularly comes into this country to conduct business. The deadbeat parent has a FAA certified flying license, a U.S. Passport, a U.S. business address in the United States, but when it comes to actually complying with his child support responsibilities, he is nowhere to be found. Although this Congress passed provisions as part of the 1996 welfare reform package to address child support by those who flee the country, not much has been done to help my constituent's situation. Specifically, between the two state child support systems, the U.S. Departments of Transportation, State and Health & Human Services, a lot of confusion remains about the proper agency in charge of ensuring payment. I am hopeful that these agencies and states will work together immediately to further close this child support loophole.

Moreover, I am very glad to see the section defining "good moral character." I think it is time that this Congress state that government should not recognize citizens as having good moral character if they are thousands of dollars behind in support of their children. Hard financial times are one thing, purposeful avoidance of the law and family responsibilities is another. I have been trying to get the FAA to recognize the nonpayment of child support as failure of "good moral character" so that the FAA would revoke the pilot certifications of pilots. I believe Mr. Cardin's amendment is a good signal to be sent to all federal agencies that this Congress is serious about this issue and that we will not tolerate non payment of child support.

As such, I heartily support this amendment, I congratulate its sponsor for his work and I strongly urge the passage of the Cardin Amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman. I rise today in support of this bill, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998. Although the states and counties are primarily responsible for child support enforcement programs, this bill attempts to facilitate their task of ensuring that every child receives financial support from both parents.

Dead-beat parents who duck out on child support are a big problem. Children rely on adults for their well-being. It is our sacred responsibility to provide for and fulfill their basic needs. To avoid this responsibility is immoral,

but unfortunately some parents do renege on such responsibility and that is why we need this new legislation. Child support should ensure that single parent homes don't need public assistance to support children and that they remain independent with a stable certain household income.

Appropriately, the welfare reform act included tough child support measures such as driver's license revocation and the development of a new hire reporting system to track offenders. Child support enforcement at the Federal and State levels is being transformed by these measures. However, despite the enactment of these requirements several states have had problems reaching compliance, and ironically could be severely affected by the proposed penalties for non-compliance.

We all understand the importance of computers with regards to the dissemination and organization of information. Computers and computer programs are especially key when handling a caseload of 20 million children nationally. As of today, only 16 States have been certified as having a comprehensive computerized systems for such purpose. However, although many others are very close to completion, their non-compliance could result in cessation of all Federal child support enforcement funding. This bill would provide states making a good faith effort to comply with the data processing requirements to avoid the current penalty in law and qualify for an alternative penalty of increasing percentages for each year of non-compliance. This proposed penalty system would continue to allocate funding to states who are in the process of reaching compliance and not truncate the substantial progress achieved. To completely cease funding would further hamper states' ability to complete their computerized systems and compound the problem of achieving such a good goal.

Currently, the federal government spends nearly \$500 million a year on child support incentive payments to states. The current incentive program is based on maximizing child support collections relative to administrative costs. The problem is that more than half of the funds are awarded to states without regard to how they actually perform in child support enforcement. We all recognize that this does not create a significant incentive for the achievement of the program goals.

The proposed incentive payment program included in this bill would, more accurately, measure the performance of state child support programs. The new incentive funding system would allow the child support incentive program to truly be driven by achieving results for families and children in need of support.

This bill addresses another important issue: adoption. The State of Minnesota has over 1,000 children awaiting adoption. H.R. 3130 would apply a severe penalty to any state that delays the adoption of a child because the adoptive parents may live in another state. With the growing number of children who are becoming wards of the state, it is important that we provide children with permanent homes, in the shortest possible time. The adoptive family pool needs to be increased nationwide in order to provide such kids the right families and support they need in order to succeed.

Minnesota state child support collections have increased 125% since 1991. In 1997, my state provide child support services for more than 200,000 cases in, and close to 40% those cases received some form of welfare benefits. Child support collected saved taxpayers \$70.7 million in AFDC grants and human services officials agree that child support is a key component in welfare reform. It is pretty simple: child support can keep families off of welfare. Every child has the right to financial support from both parents and public policy and law should facilitate such.

In an era of tight and shrinking budgets, we need to make sure that we find the most acceptable and effective ways to provide for the economic well-being of America's children. I am pleased to say that Congress understands the importance of child support and has stepped up to the plate today and in the past to make sure that child support enforcement system works better in the future. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3130, the "Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998." This bill achieves balance between two competing needs: the critical need for states to automate their child support enforcement systems to ensure that children receive the support they are due; and the imposition of crippling penalties against those states that have not yet automated their systems.

California is one of more than a dozen states that does not yet have a statewide computer system in place. If H.R. 3130 is not enacted, the state stands to lose \$4 billion in federal welfare block grant funding. This would seriously jeopardize the state's ability to provide welfare assistance to more than 2.2 million needy families and children.

The bill makes two changes that should do much to help California. It permits alternative system configurations, including linked local systems, to meet the requirement for a single statewide computer system. That requirement was included the Family Support Act of 1988. H.R. 3130 also modifies the penalty structure for dealing with states that failed to meet the October 1997 deadline, by decreasing the \$4 billion penalty to \$11 million this year.

The bill's penalty increases over time to reach \$43 million by 2000. The penalties are designed to hold California and other states accountable for implementing statewide or alternative computer systems as soon as possible. Child support payments are too important to be held hostage by ineffective computer systems.

It is imperative that California implement an automated system as soon as possible to provide essential child support services to improve the lives of children who lack the support of two parents. It is these children who benefit from improved child support enforcement, and who suffer from incompatible and ineffective systems.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—CHILD SUPPORT DATA PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 101. Alternative penalty procedure.

Sec. 102. Authority to waive single Statewide automated data processing and information retrieval system requirement.

TITLE II—CHILD SUPPORT INCENTIVE SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Incentive payments to States.

TITLE III—ADOPTION PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. More flexible penalty procedure to be applied for failing to permit inter-jurisdictional adoption.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Sec. 401. Technical corrections.

TITLE I—CHILD SUPPORT DATA PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. ALTERNATIVE PENALTY PROCEDURE.

Section 455(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 655(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4)(A) If—

"(i) the Secretary determines that a State plan under section 454 would (in the absence of this paragraph) be disapproved for the failure of the State to comply with section 454(24)(A), and that the State has made and is continuing to make a good faith effort to so comply; and

"(ii) the State has submitted to the Secretary a corrective compliance plan that describes how, by when, and at what cost the State will achieve such compliance, which has been approved by the Secretary,

then the Secretary shall not disapprove the State plan under section 454, and the Secretary shall reduce the amount otherwise payable to the State under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection for the fiscal year by the penalty amount.

"(B) In this paragraph:

"(i) The term 'penalty amount' means, with respect to a failure of a State to comply with section 454(24)—

"(I) 4 percent of the penalty base, in the case of the 1st fiscal year in which such a failure by the State occurs;

"(II) 8 percent of the penalty base, in the case of the 2nd such fiscal year;

"(III) 16 percent of the penalty base, in the case of the 3rd such fiscal year; or

"(IV) 20 percent of the penalty base, in the case of the 4th or any subsequent such fiscal year.

"(ii) The term 'penalty base' means, with respect to a failure of a State to comply with section 454(24) during a fiscal year, the amount otherwise payable to the State under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection for the preceding fiscal year.

"(C)(i) The Secretary shall waive a penalty under this paragraph for any failure of a State to comply with section 454(24)(A) during fiscal year 1998 if—

"(I) by December 31, 1997, the State has submitted to the Secretary a request that the Secretary certify the State as having met the requirements of such section;

"(II) the Secretary has provided the certification as a result of a review conducted pursuant to the request; and

"(III) the State has not failed such a review.

"(ii) If a State with respect to which a reduction is made under this paragraph for a fiscal year achieves compliance with section 454(24)(A) by the beginning of the succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall increase the amount otherwise payable to the State under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection for the succeeding fiscal year by an amount equal to 75 percent of the reduction for the fiscal year.

"(iii) The Secretary shall reduce the amount of any reduction that, in the absence of this clause, would be required to be made under this paragraph by reason of the failure of a State to achieve compliance with section 454(24)(B) during the fiscal year, by an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of the otherwise required reduction, for each State performance measure described in section 458A(b)(4) with respect to which the applicable percentage under section 458A(b)(6) for the fiscal year is 100 percent, if the Secretary has made the determination described in section 458A(b)(5)(B) with respect to the State for the fiscal year.

"(D) The preceding provisions of this paragraph (except for subparagraph (C)(i)) shall apply, separately and independently, to a failure to comply with section 454(24)(B) in the same manner in which the preceding provisions apply to a failure to comply with section 454(24)(A)."

SEC. 102. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE SINGLE STATEWIDE AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 452(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 652(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Secretary may waive any requirement of paragraph (1) or any condition specified under section 454(16), and shall waive the single statewide system requirement under sections 454(16) and 454A, with respect to a State if—

"(A) the State demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the State has or can develop an alternative system or systems that enable the State—

"(i) for purposes of section 409(a)(8), to achieve the paternity establishment percentages (as defined in section 452(g)(2)) and other performance measures that may be established by the Secretary;

"(ii) to submit data under section 454(15)(B) that is complete and reliable;

"(iii) to substantially comply with the requirements of this part; and

"(iv) in the case of a request to waive the single statewide system requirement, to—

"(I) meet all functional requirements of sections 454(16) and 454A;

"(II) ensure that calculation of distributions meets the requirements of section 457 and accounts for distributions to children in different families or in different States or sub-State jurisdictions, and for distributions to other States;

"(III) ensure that there is only 1 point of contact in the State which provides seamless case processing for all interstate case processing and coordinated, automated intrastate case management;

"(IV) ensure that standardized data elements, forms, and definitions are used throughout the State;

"(V) complete the alternative system in no more time than it would take to complete a sin-

gle statewide system that meets such requirement; and

"(VI) process child support cases as quickly, efficiently, and effectively as such cases would be processed through a single statewide system that meets such requirement;

"(B)(i) the waiver meets the criteria of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 1115(c); or

"(ii) the State provides assurances to the Secretary that steps will be taken to otherwise improve the State's child support enforcement program; and

"(C) in the case of a request to waive the single statewide system requirement, the State has submitted to the Secretary separate estimates of the total cost of a single statewide system that meets such requirement, and of any such alternative system or systems, which shall include estimates of the cost of developing and completing the system and of operating and maintaining the system for 5 years, and the Secretary has agreed with the estimates."

(b) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—Section 455(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 655(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ", and"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) equal to 66 percent of the sums expended by the State during the quarter for an alternative statewide system for which a waiver has been granted under section 452(d)(3), but only to the extent that the total of the sums so expended by the State on or after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph does not exceed the least total cost estimate submitted by the State pursuant to section 452(d)(3)(C) in the request for the waiver."

TITLE II—CHILD SUPPORT INCENTIVE SYSTEM

SEC. 201. INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651-669) is amended by inserting after section 458 the following:

"SEC. 458A. INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO STATES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other payment under this part, the Secretary shall, subject to subsection (f), make an incentive payment to each State for each fiscal year in an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF INCENTIVE PAYMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The incentive payment for a State for a fiscal year is equal to the incentive payment pool for the fiscal year, multiplied by the State incentive payment share for the fiscal year.

"(2) INCENTIVE PAYMENT POOL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In paragraph (1), the term 'incentive payment pool' means—

"(i) \$422,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

"(ii) \$429,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

"(iii) \$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

"(iv) \$461,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

"(v) \$454,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

"(vi) \$446,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

"(vii) \$458,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

"(viii) \$471,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

"(ix) \$483,000,000 for fiscal year 2008; and

"(x) for any succeeding fiscal year, the

amount of the incentive payment pool for the fiscal year that precedes such succeeding fiscal year, multiplied by the percentage (if any) by which the CPI for such preceding fiscal year exceeds the CPI for the 2nd preceding fiscal year.

"(B) CPI.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the CPI for a fiscal year is the average of the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the fiscal year. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'Consumer Price Index' means the last Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

“(3) STATE INCENTIVE PAYMENT SHARE.—In paragraph (1), the term ‘State incentive payment share’ means, with respect to a fiscal year—

“(A) the incentive base amount for the State for the fiscal year, divided by

“(B) the sum of the incentive base amounts for all of the States for the fiscal year.

“(4) INCENTIVE BASE AMOUNT.—In paragraph (3), the term ‘incentive base amount’ means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the sum of the applicable percentages (determined in accordance with paragraph (6)) multiplied by the corresponding maximum incentive base amounts for the State for the fiscal year, with respect to each of the following measures of State performance for the fiscal year:

“(A) The paternity establishment performance level.

“(B) The support order performance level.

“(C) The current payment performance level.

“(D) The arrearage payment performance level.

“(E) The cost-effectiveness performance level.

“(5) MAXIMUM INCENTIVE BASE AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (4), the maximum incentive base amount for a State for a fiscal year is—

“(i) with respect to the performance measures described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (4), the State collections base for the fiscal year; and

“(ii) with respect to the performance measures described in subparagraphs (D) and (E) of paragraph (4), 75 percent of the State collections base for the fiscal year.

“(B) DATA REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETE AND RELIABLE.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the maximum incentive base amount for a State for a fiscal year with respect to a performance measure described in paragraph (4) is zero, unless the Secretary determines, on the basis of an audit performed under section 452(a)(4)(C)(i), that the data which the State submitted pursuant to section 454(15)(B) for the fiscal year and which is used to determine the performance level involved is complete and reliable.

“(C) STATE COLLECTIONS BASE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the State collections base for a fiscal year is equal to the sum of—

“(i) 2 times the sum of—

“(I) the total amount of support collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part in cases in which the support obligation involved is required to be assigned to the State pursuant to part A or E of this title or title XIX; and

“(II) the total amount of support collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part in cases in which the support obligation involved was so assigned but, at the time of collection, is not required to be so assigned; and

“(ii) the total amount of support collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part in all other cases.

“(6) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGES BASED ON PERFORMANCE LEVELS.—

“(A) PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(i) DETERMINATION OF PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL.—The paternity establishment performance level for a State for a fiscal year is, at the option of the State, the IV-D paternity establishment percentage determined under section 452(g)(2)(A) or the statewide paternity establishment percentage determined under section 452(g)(2)(B).

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage with respect to a State's paternity establishment performance level is as follows:

“If the paternity establishment performance level is:

At least:	But less than:	The applicable percentage is:
80%	100
79%	80%	98
78%	79%	96
77%	78%	94
76%	77%	92
75%	76%	90
74%	75%	88
73%	74%	86
72%	73%	84
71%	72%	82
70%	71%	80
69%	70%	79
68%	69%	78
67%	68%	77
66%	67%	76
65%	66%	75
64%	65%	74
63%	64%	73
62%	63%	72
61%	62%	71
60%	61%	70
59%	60%	69
58%	59%	68
57%	58%	67
56%	57%	66
55%	56%	65
54%	55%	64
53%	54%	63
52%	53%	62
51%	52%	61
50%	51%	60
0%	50%	0.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the paternity establishment performance level of a State for a fiscal year is less than 50 percent but exceeds by at least 10 percentage points the paternity establishment performance level of the State for the immediately preceding fiscal year, then the applicable percentage with respect to the State's paternity establishment performance level is 50 percent.

“(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS.—

“(i) DETERMINATION OF SUPPORT ORDER PERFORMANCE LEVEL.—The support order performance level for a State for a fiscal year is the percentage of the total number of cases under the State plan approved under this part in which there is a support order during the fiscal year.

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage with respect to a State's support order performance level is as follows:

“If the support order performance level is:

At least:	But less than:	The applicable percentage is:
80%	100
79%	80%	98
78%	79%	96
77%	78%	94
76%	77%	92
75%	76%	90
74%	75%	88
73%	74%	86
72%	73%	84
71%	72%	82
70%	71%	80
69%	70%	79
68%	69%	78
67%	68%	77
66%	67%	76
65%	66%	75

“If the support order performance level is:

At least:	But less than:	The applicable percentage is:
64%	65%	74
63%	64%	73
62%	63%	72
61%	62%	71
60%	61%	70
59%	60%	69
58%	59%	68
57%	58%	67
56%	57%	66
55%	56%	65
54%	55%	64
53%	54%	63
52%	53%	62
51%	52%	61
50%	51%	60
0%	50%	0.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the support order performance level of a State for a fiscal year is less than 50 percent but exceeds by at least 5 percentage points the support order performance level of the State for the immediately preceding fiscal year, then the applicable percentage with respect to the State's support order performance level is 50 percent.

“(C) COLLECTIONS ON CURRENT CHILD SUPPORT DUE.—

“(i) DETERMINATION OF CURRENT PAYMENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL.—The current payment performance level for a State for a fiscal year is equal to the total amount of current support collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part divided by the total amount of current support owed during the fiscal year in all cases under the State plan, expressed as a percentage.

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage with respect to a State's current payment performance level is as follows:

“If the current payment performance level is:

At least:	But less than:	The applicable percentage is:
80%	100
79%	80%	98
78%	79%	96
77%	78%	94
76%	77%	92
75%	76%	90
74%	75%	88
73%	74%	86
72%	73%	84
71%	72%	82
70%	71%	80
69%	70%	79
68%	69%	78
67%	68%	77
66%	67%	76
65%	66%	75
64%	65%	74
63%	64%	73
62%	63%	72
61%	62%	71
60%	61%	70
59%	60%	69
58%	59%	68
57%	58%	67
56%	57%	66
55%	56%	65
54%	55%	64
53%	54%	63
52%	53%	62
51%	52%	61

"If the current payment performance level is:		The applicable percentage is:
At least:	But less than:	
50%	51%	60
49%	50%	59
48%	49%	58
47%	48%	57
46%	47%	56
45%	46%	55
44%	45%	54
43%	44%	53
42%	43%	52
41%	42%	51
40%	41%	50
0%	40%	0.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the current payment performance level of a State for a fiscal year is less than 40 percent but exceeds by at least 5 percentage points the current payment performance level of the State for the immediately preceding fiscal year, then the applicable percentage with respect to the State's current payment performance level is 50 percent.

"(D) COLLECTIONS ON CHILD SUPPORT ARREARAGES.—"

"(i) DETERMINATION OF ARREARAGE PAYMENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL.—The arrearage payment performance level for a State for a fiscal year is equal to the total number of cases under the State plan approved under this part in which payments of past-due child support were received during the fiscal year and part or all of the payments were distributed to the family to whom the past-due child support was owed (or, if all past-due child support owed to the family was, at the time of receipt, subject to an assignment to the State, part or all of the payments were retained by the State) divided by the total number of cases under the State plan in which there is past-due child support, expressed as a percentage.

"(ii) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage with respect to a State's arrearage payment performance level is as follows:

"If the arrearage payment performance level is:		The applicable percentage is:
At least:	But less than:	
80%	100
79%	80%	98
78%	79%	96
77%	78%	94
76%	77%	92
75%	76%	90
74%	75%	88
73%	74%	86
72%	73%	84
71%	72%	82
70%	71%	80
69%	70%	79
68%	69%	78
67%	68%	77
66%	67%	76
65%	66%	75
64%	65%	74
63%	64%	73
62%	63%	72
61%	62%	71
60%	61%	70
59%	60%	69
58%	59%	68
57%	58%	67
56%	57%	66
55%	56%	65
54%	55%	64

"If the arrearage payment performance level is:		The applicable percentage is:
At least:	But less than:	
53%	54%	63
52%	53%	62
51%	52%	61
50%	51%	60
49%	50%	59
48%	49%	58
47%	48%	57
46%	47%	56
45%	46%	55
44%	45%	54
43%	44%	53
42%	43%	52
41%	42%	51
40%	41%	50
0%	40%	0.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the arrearage payment performance level of a State for a fiscal year is less than 40 percent but exceeds by at least 5 percentage points the arrearage payment performance level of the State for the immediately preceding fiscal year, then the applicable percentage with respect to the State's arrearage payment performance level is 50 percent.

"(E) COST-EFFECTIVENESS.—"

"(i) DETERMINATION OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS PERFORMANCE LEVEL.—The cost-effectiveness performance level for a State for a fiscal year is equal to the total amount collected during the fiscal year under the State plan approved under this part divided by the total amount expended during the fiscal year under the State plan, expressed as a ratio.

"(ii) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—The applicable percentage with respect to a State's cost-effectiveness performance level is as follows:

"If the cost effectiveness performance level is:		The applicable percentage is:
At least:	But less than:	
5.00	100
4.50	4.99	90
4.00	4.50	80
3.50	4.00	70
3.00	3.50	60
2.50	3.00	50
2.00	2.50	40
0.00	2.00	0.

"(c) TREATMENT OF INTERSTATE COLLECTIONS.—In computing incentive payments under this section, support which is collected by a State at the request of another State shall be treated as having been collected in full by both States, and any amounts expended by a State in carrying out a special project assisted under section 455(e) shall be excluded.

"(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—The amounts of the incentive payments to be made to the States under this section for a fiscal year shall be estimated by the Secretary at or before the beginning of the fiscal year on the basis of the best information available. The Secretary shall make the payments for the fiscal year, on a quarterly basis (with each quarterly payment being made no later than the beginning of the quarter involved), in the amounts so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayments or underpayments which the Secretary determines were made under this section to the States involved for prior periods and with respect to which adjustment has not already

been made under this subsection. Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under the preceding sentence, any appropriations available for payments under this section are deemed obligated.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary governing the calculation of incentive payments under this section, including directions for excluding from the calculations certain closed cases and cases over which the States do not have jurisdiction.

"(f) REINVESTMENT.—A State to which a payment is made under this section shall expend the full amount of the payment to supplement, and not supplant, other funds used by the State—

"(1) to carry out the State plan approved under this part; or

"(2) for any activity (including cost-effective contracts with local agencies) approved by the Secretary, whether or not the expenditures for the activity are eligible for reimbursement under this part, which may contribute to improving the effectiveness or efficiency of the State program operated under this part."

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, the Secretary shall reduce by 1/4 the amount otherwise payable to a State under section 458 of the Social Security Act, and shall reduce by 2/3 the amount otherwise payable to a State under section 458A of such Act; and

(2) for fiscal year 2001, the Secretary shall reduce by 2/3 the amount otherwise payable to a State under section 458 of the Social Security Act, and shall reduce by 1/3 the amount otherwise payable to a State under section 458A of such Act.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Within 9 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prescribe regulations governing the implementation of section 458A of the Social Security Act when such section takes effect and the implementation of subsection (b) of this section.

(d) STUDIES.—

(1) GENERAL REVIEW OF NEW INCENTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study of the implementation of the incentive payment system established by section 458A of the Social Security Act, in order to identify the problems and successes of the system.

(B) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—

(i) REPORT ON VARIATIONS IN STATE PERFORMANCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES.—Not later than October 1, 2000, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that identifies any demographic or economic variables that account for differences in the performance levels achieved by the States with respect to the performance measures used in the system, and contains the recommendations of the Secretary for such adjustments to the system as may be necessary to ensure that the relative performance of States is measured from a baseline that takes account of any such variables.

(ii) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress an interim report that contains the findings of the study required by subparagraph (A).

(iii) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2003, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a final report that contains the final findings of the study required by subparagraph (A). The report shall include any recommendations for changes in the system that the Secretary determines would improve the operation of the child support enforcement program.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF MEDICAL SUPPORT INCENTIVE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with State directors of programs operated under part D of

title IV of the Social Security Act and representatives of children potentially eligible for medical support, shall develop a performance measure based on the effectiveness of States in establishing and enforcing medical support obligations, and shall make recommendations for the incorporation of the measure, in a revenue neutral manner, into the incentive payment system established by section 458A of the Social Security Act.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 1999, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that describes the performance measure and contains the recommendations required by subsection (A).

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 341 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 658 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PRESENT SYSTEM.—The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective with respect to a State as of the date the amendments made by section 103(a) (without regard to section 116(a)(2)) first apply to the State.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “(c)” and inserting “(b)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 341 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

(f) ELIMINATION OF PREDECESSOR INCENTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 458 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 658) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 458A of the Social Security Act, as added by section 201(a) of this Act, is redesignated as section 458.

(B) Section 455(a)(4)(C)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 655(a)(4)(C)(iii)), as added by section 101 of this Act, is amended—

(i) by striking “458A(b)(4)” and inserting “458(b)(4)”;

(ii) by striking “458A(b)(6)” and inserting “458(b)(6)”;

(iii) by striking “458A(b)(5)(B)” and inserting “458(b)(5)(B)”.

(C) Subsection (d)(1) of this section is amended by striking “458A” and inserting “458”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2001.

(g) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

TITLE III—ADOPTION PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. MORE FLEXIBLE PENALTY PROCEDURE TO BE APPLIED FOR FAILING TO PERMIT INTERJURISDICTIONAL ADOPTION.

(a) CONVERSION OF FUNDING BAN INTO STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (21);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (22) and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) provides that the State shall not—

“(A) deny or delay the placement of a child for adoption when an approved family is available outside of the jurisdiction with responsibility for handling the case of the child; or

“(B) fail to grant an opportunity for a fair hearing, as described in paragraph (12), to an

individual whose allegation of a violation of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph is denied by the State or not acted upon by the State with reasonable promptness.”.

(b) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Section 474(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(d)) is amended in each of paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking “section 471(a)(18)” and inserting “paragraph (18) or (23) of section 471(a)”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(d) RETROACTIVITY.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 202(b) of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 401. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 413(g)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 613(g)(1)) is amended by striking “Economic and Educational Opportunities” and inserting “Education and the Workforce”.

(b) Section 422(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(2)) is amended by striking “under under” and inserting “under”.

(c) Section 432(a)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 632(a)(8)) is amended by adding “; and” at the end.

(d) Section 453(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “parentage,” and inserting “parentage or”;

(2) by striking “or making or enforcing child custody or visitation orders,”; and

(3) in subparagraph (A), by decreasing the indentation of clause (iv) by 2 ems.

(e)(1) Section 5557(b) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 608 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The amendment made by section 5536(1)(A) shall not take effect with respect to a State until October 1, 2000, or such earlier date as the State may select.”.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 5557 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 637).

(f) Section 473A(c)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(c)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “November 30, 1997” and inserting “April 30, 1998”; and

(2) by striking “March 1, 1998” and inserting “July 1, 1998”.

(g) Section 474(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)) is amended by striking “(subject to the limitations imposed by subsection (b))”.

(h) Section 232 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 1314a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)(D), by striking “Energy and”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “(b)(3)(D)” and inserting “(b)(3)”.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order unless printed in the appropriate part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CARDIN:

In the table of contents of the bill, add at the end the following:

TITLE IV—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission for nonpayment of child support.

Sec. 402. Effect of nonpayment of child support on establishment of good moral character.

Sec. 403. Authorization to serve legal process in child support cases on certain arriving aliens.

Sec. 404. Authorization to obtain information on child support payments by aliens.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IV—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. ALIENS INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION FOR NONPAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) NONPAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any alien is inadmissible who is legally obligated under a judgment, decree, or order to pay child support (as defined in section 459(i) of the Social Security Act), and whose failure to pay such child support has resulted in an arrearage exceeding \$5,000, until child support payments under the judgment, decree, or order are satisfied or the alien is in compliance with an approved payment agreement.

“(ii) APPLICATION TO PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Notwithstanding section 101(a)(13)(C), an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States who has been absent from the United States for any period of time shall be regarded as seeking an admission into the United States for purposes of this subparagraph.

“(iii) WAIVER AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may waive the application of clause (i) in the case of an alien, if the Attorney General—

“(I) has received a request for the waiver from the court or administrative agency having jurisdiction over the judgment, decree, or order obligating the alien to pay child support that is referred to in such clause; and

“(II) determines that the likelihood of the arrearage being eliminated, and all subsequent child support payments timely being made by the alien, would increase substantially if the waiver were granted.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 402. EFFECT OF NONPAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) one who is legally obligated under a judgment, decree, or order to pay child support (as defined in section 459(i) of the Social Security Act), and whose failure to pay such

child support has resulted in any arrearage, unless child support payments under the judgment, decree, or order are satisfied or the alien is in compliance with an approved payment agreement."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to aliens applying for a benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act on or after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 403. AUTHORIZATION TO SERVE LEGAL PROCESS IN CHILD SUPPORT CASES ON CERTAIN ARRIVING ALIENS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 235(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) **AUTHORITY TO SERVE PROCESS IN CHILD SUPPORT CASES.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To the extent consistent with State law, immigration officers are authorized to serve on any alien who is an applicant for admission to the United States legal process with respect to any action to enforce or establish a legal obligation of an individual to pay child support (as defined in section 459(i) of the Social Security Act).

"(B) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'legal process' means any writ, order, summons or other similar process, which is issued by—

"(i) a court or an administrative agency of competent jurisdiction in any State, territory, or possession of the United States; or

"(ii) an authorized official pursuant to an order of such a court or agency or pursuant to State or local law."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to aliens applying for admission to the United States on or after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 404. AUTHORIZATION TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS BY ALIENS.

Section 453(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) **PROVISION TO ATTORNEY GENERAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE OF INFORMATION ON PERSONS DELINQUENT IN CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS.**—On request by the Attorney General or the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide the requestor with such information as the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines may aid them in determining whether an alien is delinquent in the payment of child support."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make certain aliens determined to be delinquent in the payment of child support inadmissible and ineligible for naturalization, and for other purposes."

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and also the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), as well as the administration in helping to craft the amendment that I offer. This matter was

brought to my attention by a constituent who was trying to collect child support from a foreign national. The foreign national came to our country regularly as a businessperson making considerable money off of his business ventures here in the United States. My constituent was unable to collect child support because there was no effective way of collecting child support from that foreign national. The amendment before my colleagues would correct that circumstance. It would deny a visa or a reentry to a noncustodial parent, foreign national, that is \$5,000 or more in arrears in child support. It would also deny naturalization if the person is in non-compliance with a valid child support order. Lastly, the amendment would give new authority for the service of summons and court orders at our borders for foreign nationals.

Madam Chairman, this particular amendment would place a foreign national in a comparable position as we place our own citizens. If an American is \$5,000 or more in arrears in child support, we deny our citizen the right to have a passport. The least we can do for foreign nationals is treat them likewise and deny them the ability to enter our country. For Americans we also deny driver's licenses and other professional certificates. I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order that we provide comparable abilities for enforcing child support orders by foreign nationals.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1245

Mr. SHAW. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is strictly within the spirit of this legislation and what we are trying to accomplish. I compliment the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for bringing this to our attention, and I vigorously support his amendment.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for his help in developing this amendment and bringing this matter forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILMAN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3130) to provide for alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, pursuant to House Resolution 378, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—414

Abercrombie	Bliley	Castle
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Chabot
Aderholt	Blunt	Chambliss
Allen	Boehler	Chenoweth
Andrews	Boehner	Christensen
Archer	Bonilla	Clay
Armey	Bonior	Clayton
Bachus	Borski	Clement
Baesler	Boswell	Clyburn
Baker	Boucher	Coble
Baldacci	Boyd	Coburn
Ballenger	Brady	Collins
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Combest
Barr	Brown (FL)	Condit
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Conyers
Barrett (WI)	Bryant	Cook
Bartlett	Bunning	Cooksey
Barton	Burr	Costello
Bass	Burton	Cox
Bateman	Buyer	Coyne
Becerra	Callahan	Cramer
Bentsen	Calvert	Crane
Bereuter	Camp	Crapo
Berman	Campbell	Cubin
Berry	Canady	Cummings
Bilbray	Cannon	Cunningham
Bishop	Cardin	Danner
Blagojevich	Carson	Davis (FL)

Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Deal	(TX)	Obey
DeFazio	Jefferson	Oliver
DeGette	Jenkins	Ortiz
Delahunt	John	Owens
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Oxley
DeLay	Johnson (WI)	Packard
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pappas
Dickey	Jones	Parker
Dicks	Kanjorski	Pascarella
Dixon	Kaptur	Pastor
Doggett	Kasich	Paxon
Dooley	Kelly	Payne
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Pease
Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Duncan	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)
Dunn	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Edwards	Kim	Petri
Ehlers	Kind (WI)	Pickering
Ehrlich	King (NY)	Pickett
Emerson	Kingston	Pitts
Engel	Kleczka	Pombo
English	Klug	Pomeroy
Ensign	Knollenberg	Porter
Eshoo	Kolbe	Portman
Etheridge	Kucinich	Price (NC)
Evans	LaFalce	Pryce (OH)
Everett	LaHood	Radanovich
Ewing	Lampson	Rahall
Farr	Lantos	Ramstad
Fattah	Largent	Rangel
Fawell	Latham	Redmond
Fazio	LaTourette	Regula
Filner	Lazio	Reyes
Foley	Leach	Riggs
Forbes	Levin	Riley
Ford	Lewis (CA)	Rivers
Fossella	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Roemer
Fox	Linder	Rogan
Frank (MA)	Lipinski	Rogers
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Rohrabacher
Frelinghuysen	LoBlundo	Ros-Lehtinen
Frost	Lofgren	Rothman
Furse	Lowe	Roukema
Gallegly	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Royce
Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Rush
Gephardt	Manton	Ryun
Gibbons	Manzullo	Sabo
Gilchrest	Markey	Salmon
Gillmor	Martinez	Sanchez
Gilman	Mascara	Sanders
Goode	Matsui	Sandlin
Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford
Goodling	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Gordon	McCollum	Saxton
Goss	McCrery	Scarborough
Graham	McDade	Schaefer, Dan
Granger	McGovern	Schaffer, Bob
Green	McHale	Schumer
Greenwood	McHugh	Scott
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Sessions
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shadegg
Hamilton	McKinney	Shaw
Hansen	McNulty	Shays
Hastert	Meehan	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Sisisky
Hayworth	Menendez	Skaggs
Hefley	Metcalfe	Skeen
Hefner	Mica	Skelton
Herger	Millender	Slaughter
Hill	McDonald	Smith (MI)
Hilleary	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Hilliard	Miller (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hinchey	Minge	Smith (TX)
Hinojosa	Mink	Smith, Adam
Hobson	Moolkey	Smith, Linda
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Snowbarger
Holden	Moran (KS)	Snyder
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Solomon
Horn	Morella	Souder
Hostettler	Murtha	Spence
Houghton	Myrick	Spratt
Hoyer	Nadler	Stabenow
Hulshof	Neal	Stark
Hunter	Nethercutt	Stearns
Hutchinson	Neumann	Stenholm
Hyde	Ney	Stokes
Inglis	Northup	Strickland
Istook	Norwood	Stump

Stupak	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Sununu	Traficant	Weller
Talent	Turner	Wexler
Tanner	Upton	Weyand
Tauscher	Velázquez	White
Tauzin	Vento	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Wise
Thompson	Wamp	Wolf
Thornberry	Waters	Woolsey
Thune	Watkins	Wynn
Thurman	Watt (NC)	Yates
Tiahrt	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)
Tierney	Waxman	Young (FL)
Torres	Weldon (FL)	

NOES—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—15

Bilirakis	Harman	Poshard
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Quinn
Doolittle	Klink	Schiff
Ganske	Luther	Shinkus
Gonzalez	McDermott	Thomas

□ 1314

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make certain aliens determined to be delinquent in the payment of child support inadmissible and ineligible for naturalization, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, due to a death in my family, I regret that I was unable to vote after 3:00 pm yesterday. If I had been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call Number 28; Yea on Roll Call Number 29, Yea on Roll Call Number 30; Present on Roll Call Number 31; Nay on Roll Call Number 32; Nay on Roll Call Number 33; Nay on Roll Call Number 34; Nay on Roll Call Number 35; Yea on Roll Call Number 36; and Yea on Roll Call Number 37, final passage of the U.S.-Puerto Rico Political Status Act.

Also, I would have voted "Yea" on final passage of H.R. 3130, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act, and "Yea" on final passage of H.R. 2369, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 39 I was unavoidably detained at the White House meeting with the President on the Medicare Commission. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3130, CHILD SUPPORT PERFORMANCE AND INCENTIVE ACT OF 1998

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3130, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3130, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Speaker, I request this time in order to inquire of the leader as to the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have finished legislative business for the week.

The House will reconvene at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 9 for a pro forma session.

On Tuesday, March 10, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider two suspensions: H. Con. Res. 206, a resolution to permit the use of the Capitol Rotunda for a ceremony to remember the victims of the Holocaust; and possibly S. 419, the Birth Defects Prevention Act of 1997. Any recorded votes on these suspensions will be postponed until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, March 10.

On Wednesday and Thursday, March 11 and 12, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the following legislation: H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act; H.R. 2883, the Government Performance and Results Act Technical Amendments of 1997; and H.R. 992, a bill to amend the Tucker Act.

Madam Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week by 6 p.m. on Thursday, March 12.

There will be no legislative business and no votes on Friday, March 13.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT "BOB" CHILDS

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to speak about one of our House's more dedicated employees. Today I would like to acknowledge the career of Bob Childs, who recently left us for retirement after 37 years' work on Capitol Hill.

Bob came to government service in 1960 in the electrical engineering department under the Architect of the Capitol to work on the inauguration of President Kennedy.

In 1961 he assisted in wiring the House for sound. Due in large measure to his efforts, our voices ring loud and clear through this Chamber to this very day.

Early in 1970 Bob worked on the Senate's very first sound system, and in 1973 became the supervisor for the sound systems of both Chambers.

In 1976 Bob participated in the design and installation of our present sound system here in the House, while maintaining supervisory responsibility for its overall operation and for the TV lighting in the Chamber for all joint sessions. It is worth noting that Bob's schedule often required him to arrive at 7 a.m. and to remain on duty until the session ended after special orders.

During his 37 years on the Hill, Bob accumulated a wealth of knowledge as to how this institution functioned in terms of both the legislative process and behind the scenes operations which support our legislative efforts here. His eagerness to share his knowledge, combined with the skill and integrity always present in carrying out his duties, leaves us at a loss on many levels. He can easily be classified as a resource, and we know all too well that a resource is rarely appreciated until it is no longer available. But in Bob's case, we want to let him know how much he has meant to us in this institution and to convey our thanks for a job well done for 37 years.

In closing, it is important to us that Bob realize how special his contributions have been and that wherever retirement takes him and Nancy, to Myrtle Beach, to Cape May, to the Maryland or Delaware coast, we hope that his path will from time to time lead back to us.

Madam Speaker, we say to Bob, "Good-bye, good luck and God Bless you."

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to add the minority's accolades to Bob Childs and express our appreciation to the leader for highlighting his service to our institution.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RETURNING TO THE SENATE THE BILL S. 104, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982

Mr. ENSIGN. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 379) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That the bill of the Senate (S. 104) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

The gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN).

Mr. ENSIGN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am joined by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) here today in support of this resolution.

This resolution is necessary to return to the Senate the bill S. 104, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997. S. 104 contravenes the constitutional requirement that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. It would repeal a revenue provision and replace it with a user fee.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 imposes a fee of one mill per kilowatt hour on electricity generated by nuclear energy. S. 104 would repeal this fee and replace it with a new fee that would be limited to the amounts appropriated for nuclear waste disposal.

The current one mill per kilowatt hour fee is unquestionably a revenue measure. Regardless of the stated intent of the fee, the amount of fee proceeds collected have greatly exceeded costs. The fee is being used to raise revenue to finance the Federal Government generally.

Therefore, the Senate bill, by repealing what is in effect a tax, constitutes a revenue bill. The provision would have a direct effect on Federal revenues. The proposed change is "revenue affecting" and therefore constitutes a revenue measure in the constitutional sense. Accordingly, I am asking that the House insist on its constitutional prerogatives.

Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize that this action speaks solely to the constitutional prerogative of the House and not to the merits of the Senate

bill. The proposed action today is procedural in nature and is necessary to preserve the prerogatives of the House to originate revenue measures. It makes clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with revenue measures is for the House to act first on a revenue bill and for the Senate to accept it or amend it as it sees fit.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The Constitution places the responsibility of initiating revenue measures in the House of Representatives. This resolution merely preserves the prerogatives and responsibility of the House.

S. 104, as noted, would contravene the constitutional restriction since it would repeal a present-law revenue measure and create a user fee.

It is my understanding that today's action will have no effect on efforts to move nuclear waste legislation since the House has already passed legislation to address this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENSIGN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVISING MEMBERS OF PUBLIC HEARING OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to advise Members of the House that the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has scheduled a public hearing at 3 p.m. on Monday, March 16, 1998. This hearing has been arranged so the committee may take testimony about the report of the Inspector General of the CIA regarding allegations that the CIA was somehow involved with the spread of crack cocaine to California during the 1980s.

As Members know, since the publication in August of 1996 of a series of articles in the San Jose Mercury News, our committee has been conducting an oversight investigation into the validity of the very serious allegations made by those news stories. This public hearing is an important step in that process.

We have invited the CIA's Inspector General, Mr. Fred Hitz, to discuss his investigation and to walk us through the conclusions in his report, which

has been available to the public since the end of January.

In addition, I wish to inform Members who have an interest in this subject and who may wish to comment on the IG's report that they are welcome to testify before the subcommittee on March 16. Members wishing to avail themselves of this opportunity should contact the committee as soon as possible so proper arrangements can be made.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 9, 1998, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 10, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

UNFAIRNESS IN TAX CODE: MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, let me explain why enactment of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act is so important with a series of questions. Do Americans feel that it is fair that our Tax Code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples pay \$1,400 more in taxes than identical couples with identical incomes living together outside of marriage? Do Americans feel that it is right that our Tax Code actually pro-

vides an incentive to get divorced? Clearly it is unfair and it is wrong. Twenty-one million Americans paying \$1,400 more just because they are married. On the south side of Chicago in the south suburbs, \$1,400 is one year's tuition at a local community college, 3 months of child care at a local day care center, several months' worth of car payments. The Marriage Tax Elimination Act now has 238 bipartisan cosponsors. It would immediately eliminate the marriage tax penalty. The marriage tax penalty is not only unfair, it is wrong. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty and do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. Tax code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

In January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus.

A surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending totaling at least \$46-48 billion in new programs—we believe that a top priority should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel it is fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel it is fair that the average married working couple pays almost \$1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong!

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy matrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working women's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist, at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes \$30,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home \$30,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15%.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE IN THE SOUTH SUBURBS

	Machinist	School teacher	Couple
Adjusted gross income	\$30,500	\$30,500	\$61,000
Less personal exemption and standard deduction	6,550	6,550	11,800
Taxable income	23,950	23,950	49,200
Tax liability	3,592.50	3,592.50	8,563
Marriage penalty			1,378

But if they choose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of \$61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of \$1,400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay \$1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Everyday we got closer to April 15th more married couples will be realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Particularly if you think of it in terms of a down payment on a house or a car, one year's tuition at a local community college, or several months worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, Congressman DAVID MCINTOSH and I have authored the Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

It would allow married couples a choice in filing their income taxes, either jointly or as individuals—which ever way lets them keep more of their own money.

Our bill already has the bipartisan cosponsorship of 232 Members of the House and a similar bill in the Senate also enjoys widespread support.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote "the era of big government is over."

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government. But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business. And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math. It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect of it. What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society.

We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty . . . a bipartisan priority. Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Lets eliminate The Marriage Tax Penalty and do it now!

WHICH IS BETTER?

The President's Proposal to expand the child care tax credit will pay for only 2 to 3 weeks of child care. The *Weller-McIntosh Marriage Tax Elimination Act HR 2456*, will allow married couples to pay for 3 months of child care.

Which Is Better, 3 Weeks Or 3 Months?

CHILD CARE OPTIONS UNDER THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

	Average tax relief	Average weekly day care cost	Weeks day care
Marriage Tax Elimination Act	\$1,400	\$127	11
President's child care tax credit	358	127	2.8

□ 1330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRAGEDY IN SARASOTA, FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to describe to my colleagues a tragedy which occurred in my congressional district of Florida. On the afternoon of November 7, 1997, in Sarasota, Florida, a 13-year-old girl returned home to discover the body of her mother, Sheila Bellush, on the kitchen floor. Bellush, a mother of six, including 2-year old quadruplets, had been brutally murdered. Her throat was slashed and she was shot in the head. When her body was found, her quadruplets were crawling next to her in her blood.

The trail of evidence immediately led to Jose Luis Del Toro, a United States citizen born and raised in Texas. Del Toro fled to Mexico where he was captured on November 20th.

I would like to share with Members, Mr. Speaker, an excerpt from a message sent to me by my constituents Paul and Anita Marshall: "Both my wife Anita and I are constituents of yours residing in North Port, Florida. We are also full-time law enforcement officers. Recently I responded to the Bellush murder scene and had a first-hand account of this brutal crime. Having been in law enforcement for 19 years, this was the most brutal of crimes I have ever seen."

Now, Del Toro has been captured. This should have been an open-and-shut case. Del Toro should have been quickly deported for illegal entry and quickly returned to Florida to stand trial for murder. However, when Mexican officials learned of the charges

against Del Toro, they refused to simply deport him and instead started lengthy extradition procedures and declared Del Toro would not be returned unless the United States waived the death penalty.

The Sarasota community I represent was outraged, and rightfully so. This move by Mexico is an obstruction of the United States judicial process. It is a violation of U.S. sovereignty, and it is an abomination that we allow this to happen.

This was a United States citizen who was accused of committing a heinous crime against another United States citizen on United States soil, and Mexico apparently feels that it can step right in and prevent this murderer from being brought to justice. I am offended by the arrogance of any Nation that seeks to dictate to the United States what United States judicial policy should be.

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall, my constituents from North Port, continued on in their correspondence: "How can Mexico dictate what judicial action should be taken in our country, especially after all the financial aid and other assistance we have given Mexico over the years?"

I would like to ask the same question. The answer is amazing. The United States actually grants Mexico the right to interfere with our judicial system in this manner. The U.S.-Mexico Extradition Treaty of 1978 allows Mexico the right to deny extradition if the individual in question may be subject to the death penalty upon return.

I believe this is a dangerous policy with a bordering country where murderers can drive across the border within hours of committing a crime. This is why I am introducing a resolution calling for the administration to renegotiate our extradition treaty with Mexico. I ask my colleagues to join with me and support this resolution.

IMMORALITY AND HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, many constituents have called on me to condemn President Clinton or to condemn former Judge Kenneth Starr. Many are convinced that the President has not been honest in his disavowals of indecent behavior, and it is time for others in public life to demand a fuller explanation from him. Many others are convinced that the recent allegations about the President are irrelevant to his performance in office or his right to stay in office and should be dropped.

It is wrong for the President of the United States to have sexual relations with a White House intern. It is wrong even if she consented. It is wrong be-

cause the President is married. It is wrong because the concept of consent is strained between persons of such differing persons of power. It is wrong because sex outside of marriage is wrong. It is wrong to lie about all of these matters. It is wrong to ask, induce or threaten others to lie about them as well.

Not everything that is wrong is illegal. Not everything that is illegal should be grounds for impeachment. For example, taking God's name in vain is wrong. A law to punish it, however, would violate the first amendment, and it is inconceivable that we would impeach a President for blasphemy, no matter how flagrant.

In addition, our country has rules to protect all of us, and we are all better off for those rules' existence. Foremost among these rules is that we demand proof of wrongdoing. Not simply in criminal wrong, but also in our daily judgments of each other, it is wise and good to require proof rather than to operate on a presumption of guilt, fueled by rumor.

President Clinton has asserted his innocence to every allegation listed above. There may be reason to doubt his denials, devoid as they are of any explanation for the questionable conduct. But there is also a process to follow to ensure that no one's reputation, let alone a President's tenure in office, be jeopardized lightly.

To defend his character, however, President Clinton does owe all of us a complete explanation. It is simply not true that rules of court prohibit him from comment. They do not. It is his choice alone that keeps him from comment.

It still is quite a further matter, however, to find in all of this evidence of a crime or of an impeachable offense. Herein lies the confusion. Former Judge Kenneth Starr appears to be investigating the lurid using means we usually reserve for investigating organized crime suspects. What he is attempting, I suspect, is to develop a case of the President inducing witnesses like Webb Hubbell to lie or be uncooperative in the Whitewater matter, and by showing the President to be doing so in the Paula Jones matter, he hopes to have a more convincing case. But more convincing to whom?

Judge Starr has announced he will not be seeking to indict the President criminally, pledging instead to turn over whatever evidence of impeachable evidence of impeachable offenses he may find to the House Committee on the Judiciary. That committee, however, can carry on its own investigation. It exists constitutionally apart from any special counsel. It predates the special counsel by almost 200 years.

Insofar as the President's own behavior is at issue, therefore, it is time to move from Judge Starr's forum to the

House Committee on the Judiciary, after a reasonable but short time to allow Judge Starr to do so in an orderly fashion. All matters presently pending before other committees of Congress relating to grounds of impeachment of President Clinton should also be consolidated before the House Committee on the Judiciary. These other committees and Judge Starr himself may continue investigations into the potential wrongdoing of others. Indeed, Judge Starr has already won 13 convictions or guilty pleas.

I fully expect to follow the work of the Committee on the Judiciary with great care and, if the evidence warrants it, to vote to impeach President Clinton. I would be prepared to do so on the merits, whether the economy is doing well or doing poorly. I urge this action in the alternative hope that if the President is deserving of impeachment, the process might start sufficiently soon to allow for the speedy removal of office of one unworthy of it, or in the alternative, if the President is not deserving of impeachment, that the President be freed from the strains attendant upon the several continuing investigations.

As to the President's personal reputation, I am very sad. If he continues to refuse to volunteer a more credible defense than his simple denial, then he risks becoming an object of ridicule, trivializing himself and much that he seeks to accomplish in his remaining years in office. He has already lost much credibility, and that is not because of any actions of Judge Starr. He has lost credibility because he has minced words time after time in denying what is accused while refusing to say what did happen.

It may turn out that the President did act immorally on many occasions and seemingly without remorse. And yes, this does matter to his official functions. Lying comes easier with practice. Viewing a subordinate employee as an object for one's own gratifications dehumanizes both persons. But the authority of private judgment, the sense of regret of our country might remain as the public matter goes to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member must avoid personal references to the President of the United States in debate.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE FOWLER

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and now former employee of this great institution, Wayne Fowler. We

all have two families when we come here, one back home and the one we make here. I am proud to include Wayne in my family here in this House. It makes it all the easier that we coincidentally share the same last name.

When I first met Wayne, we became fast friends. We had so much in common besides the Fowler name. Wayne is a native of the State that I now represent. We both attended college in Georgia and found our way to careers on Capitol Hill. While I was serving as a legislative assistant to Georgia Congressman Robert Stephens in the late 1960s, Wayne was serving as an LA to Florida Congressman Don Fuqua. Prior to that Wayne worked for Congressman Charlie Bennett, the Member whom I succeeded in 1992.

Wayne and I both left the Hill for a while, only to be drawn back by our mutual interest in public service. Wayne served this House for 32 years, 22 of these right here at this rostrum in the House. As he begins his much deserved retirement, I want to wish him well and thank him on behalf of a grateful Congress. He is already missed.

IN CELEBRATION OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to acknowledge my colleague who spoke earlier on this whole issue of Ken Starr and the President. I thank him for his balance.

Let me say that I associate myself with the sense of his remarks that none of us should be acting precipitously. As a Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have repeatedly stated that this is a time for facts, measured efforts, full investigations and the cessation of accusations. I hope my colleague on the other side of the aisle would likewise join me in these comments, for, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems even to me that calls for impeachment and impeachment proceedings may themselves be precipitous.

I rose today to celebrate a very important occasion this month as we begin to celebrate women's history month. That is my pride in the announcement today by the President of the United States along with Ms. Hillary Rodham Clinton and Dan Goldin, NASA Administrator, of the selection of Colonel Eileen Collins to be the first commander of the space shuttle and NASA where she is located in Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas. As a Congresswoman from Houston and a member of the House Committee on Science, I cannot tell Members what an important day this was for those of us who believe in the opportunities for

women, wherever their preparedness and their abilities may take them.

□ 1345

As a member of the House Committee on Science, I was greatly concerned at the recent national study that showed that our children, no matter who they were, were not competitive internationally with math and science. How wonderful it was to hear Colonel Eileen Collins salute her parents as her first teachers and her love for math and science. How wonderful it was for her to be able to say to me how she would enthusiastically join me in visiting some of my schools in order to share herself as a role model in explaining to young people the value of math and science.

Another special note that Colonel Collins started out in community college, which says to all Americans in support of the President's efforts to ensure that every American has a chance, an opportunity for higher education, and that they can be successful and can start in their community college systems where they can go for free under new legislation we just passed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to support Eileen Collins and say we have important issues before us, and that is why, as I close, that I want to say that the Children's Congressional Caucus will be dealing with the question of mental illness that impacts our children. I think no child should be left out. And what we want to do is to focus our attention on ensuring that any child who has a diagnosed behavioral emotional problem is not cast aside and it is said, well, they cannot be anything. Our hearing will focus on enhancing the resources, accessibility to resources, and helping those parents who are trying to help their children.

This has been a combination of issues, but I think they match each other, one by starting out and saying let us get the facts regarding the leadership of this Nation; let us salute a woman who is already a leader, who will lead us into space; and let us not forget our children, those who may be thought of as castaways, and let us make sure we provide all the resources we can give to our children to make them the very best in this Nation. Let us not be spendthrifts or cut the dollars where we need them in order to help our children.

INTRODUCTION OF PARENTAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, recent news reports reflect that American children are not doing very well in math and science when compared to other countries. This is not good news,

especially when we think of how well Americans will compete in the future. Our world is becoming more and more technological and we rely on math and science every day, and so when we see this lack of an ability to compete, we should all be concerned.

Now the solution to this problem is not simple; it is a multifaceted solution that is needed. But today I want to focus on one of the facets: getting parents involved in the education process.

Today there are barriers in place, obstacles that keep parents from becoming involved. Teachers and principals have told me that when parents are involved with their children's education, the kids do better and the schools are stronger. So, Mr. Speaker, I have submitted legislation to encourage parental involvement by ensuring that parents have access to their children's public school records. I believe an informed parent is an involved parent, an involved parent in their child's education.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act is based on the need to provide active involved parents with information that is vital for them to exercise their right to guide the upbringing of their children. The rationale for this legislation derives from an alarming number of recent cases in which the rights of parents have been ignored and they have had to go to court to secure the basic information which the Parental Freedom of Information Act provides for.

The current hodgepodge of State and Federal laws and legal precedents simply does not provide parents of public school children with a clear-cut right to access information regarding the content of the education their children are receiving.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act will amend the 1974 Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, called FERPA, and strengthen the right of parents of elementary and secondary public school students by guaranteeing parents access to the curriculum their children are exposed to. This includes textbooks, audiovisual materials, manuals, journals, films and any supplementary materials. It will provide access to testing materials administered to their children. It will also require parental consent prior to any student being required to undergo medical, psychological or psychiatric examination, testing or treatment at school, except for emergency care.

Now, this provision does not apply to children who voluntarily wish to meet with a school counselor or visit the nurse's office for medical assistance and services.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act will withhold Federal funds from educational institutions which deny parents access to this information. In addition, the act will allow

parents to seek judicial relief and recoup legal costs when their access to this information is denied.

This is an important new enforcement device placed directly in the hands of parents. The Parental Freedom of Information Act in no way seeks to influence the content of curriculum or tests. It simply guarantees that parents have access to the basic information which they must be aware of if they are going to become actively engaged in the education of their child.

The need for the enactment of the Parental Freedom of Information Act is seen when considering some of the following situations: Parents in California were forced to go to court to obtain copies of the curriculum in their sons' decision-making class. The parents believed that the class actually involved a number of family issues and were trying to decide whether they would attempt to remove their two sons from this class.

In the State of Texas, a mandatory test was administered by the Texas Education Agency and they refused to allow parents to view the test even after it was given. Officials claimed their test was secure or secret, and they would not even allow teachers and administrators or school board members to review the test.

In my own experience as a member of the State's Senate Education Committee in Kansas, I requested to review a State standard assessment test. After initially being denied access to the test, eventually I was allowed to see what other taxpaying parents were denied. I discovered in a junior high reading comprehension test a story of a junior high girl who developed a relationship with the statue of a crow. In this story the crow becomes the girl's spiritual guide.

This was offensive to most all parents in the State of Kansas. It did not reflect community standards, yet every junior high student in Kansas was going to be subjected to such a wrong philosophy. Fortunately, because of my position on the State's Senate Education Committee, the story was changed and there were other wonderful alternatives, stories about the history of Kansas or the history of America, yet they were overlooked to purport such a wrong philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Parental Freedom of Information Act.

ASIAN TRADE REFORM IMPLEMENTATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support for legislation I introduced to increase fairness in international trade.

As my record shows, I am a strong advocate of fair trade and expanding markets for American products. Our sound economy is due largely to our commitment to open trade. This open trade has led to global competition, which, in turn, has improved our productivity and our efficiency.

We are all painfully aware of the economic crisis in Asia. We will likely have a spirited debate on what the United States should do to help out our troubled allies and trading partners in that region. Regardless of whether we vote to use more American money to replenish IMF accounts, we are already the largest contributor to the fund. As such, it is our obligation to speak up for what is right.

My bill does not focus on what role the United States should have in the Asian recovery. My bill is focused on what the Asians should do to help themselves by upholding their trade reform commitments and ensuring fair trade. Many of the so-called Asian tigers have enjoyed dramatic growth by focusing on exports.

They have insulated their markets from foreign competition and often subsidized their exports to undercut the world price. This lack of real competition has weakened their domestic economies to the breaking point.

As the world struggles to deal with the Asian crisis, we ought to take responsibility as the world leader in trade and democracy. The bill I have introduced would use our voice and vote as the IMF, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank to insist that promised marketing-opening reforms are carried out in Asia.

For too long we have been shut out of these growing markets. For too long we have faced Asian goods unfairly dumped into our markets, hurting our factories and our workers.

Now is the time to make the changes that will help. We can help our workers and businesses by requiring that the Asians allow fair trade, and fair markets, for U.S. goods.

I urge my colleagues to support the Asian Trade Reform Implementation Act. It will send a strong and firm message to Asia: Open up your doors to U.S. products.

HOMELESS VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, from the first bullet fired at Lexington to the sand dunes of the Persian Gulf, this Nation has asked its citizens to step forward and defend the ideals and principles upon which representative self-government is founded.

Those who responded honorably to this summons have earned the privilege to be considered veterans. Their

courage is not only measured in battle, but by their willingness to leave their homes, families, and their dreams behind and fight in defense of these principles.

Many of our citizens have paid the ultimate price in Europe, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf. For some, the battle continues as they try to deal physically, emotionally, and mentally with scars that will not heal. Many have turned to drugs and alcohol for solace while others still suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder.

To these veterans, our Nation owes gratitude and respect, but words are simply not enough to convey this message. Our actions must speak louder than our words. We must continue our commitment to our veterans.

One area where improvements are needed is the housing and shelter for homeless veterans. Last year, I introduced legislation to address the plight of homeless veterans. H.R. 1754, the Robert Stodola Homeless Veteran Assistance Act, will require a 20 percent set-aside for homeless veterans under the Stewart McKinney Act program. For far too long, our veterans have not received adequate funding and services to help them transition back into mainstream society.

Earlier this week, we passed H.R. 217, the Homeless Housing Programs Consolidation and Flexibility Act. This legislation will consolidate current homeless programs and create two new block grants. The goal of this legislation is to give local communities greater flexibility in developing a wholistic plan to assist our homeless population.

H.R. 217 also includes an amendment that I offered with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). This amendment will give veteran advocacy groups an opportunity to participate in the local advisory boards as they coordinate a community homeless plan. In addition, homeless veterans will be considered a special needs population, making them a targeted population for housing programs and services.

Lastly, the Department of Housing and Urban Development will begin reporting data on homeless veterans in both the pre-grant application process and the post-grant reporting process. All grantees will provide information on the number of homeless individuals, including veterans, and how they plan to help them. This is a small but significant step in an effort to help our veterans. I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) for supporting my amendment.

In conclusion, I want to share with my colleagues the life of Robert Stodola, the veteran after whom the legislation is named. He was a veteran of the U.S. Army. He moved to Whatcom County in the early 1980s.

On February 1, 1992, he was living in his Pinto station wagon near Nugents

Corner on the Nooksack River. Two 19-year-old men needed money and, as reported in the Bellingham Herald, planned to roll the old man.

Armed with a baseball bat and tire iron, the two assailants beat Robert Stodola and stole approximately \$4. They stole \$4. After he was stabbed several times in the back, he was dumped into the river where, according to an autopsy, he drowned.

This legislation is a reminder to all Americans of the plight faced by homeless veterans. The veteran provisions in H.R. 217 will help get homeless veterans off the streets and into recovery.

If we are willing to summon our young people to battle, let us also be willing to provide housing, health care, and security for those who return.

□ 1400

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING PRESIDENT'S CERTIFICATION OF MEXICO AS COOPERATING FULLY IN WAR ON DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this afternoon to ask for support and cosponsorship of House Joint Resolution 114. This is a resolution that has been introduced by myself and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that would decertify Mexico.

Most people are not familiar with the certification process. The certification process is a good process that does certify through our State Department whether or not individual countries are making progress in ending drug production and illegal drug trafficking. That certification is made. Once it is made, a country becomes eligible for benefits of the United States Government, benefits such as foreign aid, financial assistance, trade benefits and military assistance. It is a simple law and it does work and it does put pressure on countries who want these benefits of the United States to take action to stop illegal drug trafficking and production.

We do not believe that Mexico has made progress in stopping the wave of illegal drugs coming into this country. Unfortunately, last week the Clinton administration certified Mexico that they are making progress.

I ask my colleagues, is this progress? Let me cite the facts about Mexico:

Seventy percent of the hard drugs entering the United States come in through Mexico. That was the statistic provided to my national security subcommittee a year ago and it is the statistic today. A wave of heroin, a wave of cocaine, a wave of methamphetamines and illegal hard

designer drugs are coming into this country and affecting our youth, our schools, our cities and our streets.

Mexico has failed to extradite a single drug kingpin trafficker to the United States to stand trial.

The facts are that Mexico has failed to adopt a maritime narcotics agreement with the United States.

The facts are that the United States drug enforcement chief, the chief of our DEA, Tom Constantine recommended against certification of Mexico according to the Washington Post. Let me quote what he said in a confidential assessment by the Drug Enforcement Administration. It says that the country has had a continued impunity to arrest or to detain the country's biggest drug traffickers.

Let me quote. During the past year, the analysis reads, the government of Mexico has not accomplished its counternarcotics goal or succeeded in cooperation with the United States Government. The level of drug corruption in Mexico continues unabated. This is from the director of our United States Drug Enforcement Agency.

The Mexican government is involved in corruption from the street level to its highest offices and ministries.

Mexico has refused to authorize United States law enforcement agents to carry weapons for their own protection.

The scope of Mexican drug trafficking has increased significantly. This is not just my opinion, this is also the opinion of our Drug Enforcement Agency.

Again heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine continue to enter the United States in unprecedented quantities.

Let me tell my colleagues what this tidal wave of drugs is doing. We have 2 million Americans in prison. I am told that nearly 80 percent of those who are incarcerated in the jails and prisons of the United States are there because of their relationship to drugs, drug abuse or a drug-related crime. Heroin, cocaine and methamphetamine use by our youth has skyrocketed. We must decertify Mexico. I ask for Members' cosponsorship of this joint resolution.

SALUTE TO ROCKY FORD, COLORADO AND THE BOETTCHER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Rocky Ford, Colorado is one of the greatest places on earth. Rarely do great families, prosperous entrepreneurs, genuine leaders and abundant agriculture coexist in such prodigious proportions as they do in Rocky Ford.

Rocky Ford was doubly blessed recently to receive an important private

grant which promises to move a significant community project closer to completion. The objective of my remarks is to highlight this event and the people of Rocky Ford and to further call the Nation's attention to this great city and to the foundation which has made the municipality even greater.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colorado's Boettcher Foundation, which has consistently improved the lives of Colorado's residents through grants for community projects and scholarships for students. The State of Colorado has clearly benefited by the work of the fine men and women of the organization and we all owe them a great debt of thanks. Today along with my constituents in Rocky Ford, I applaud the foundation specifically for its generous gift to the city and its people of funds to expand the Rocky Ford community center.

The funds donated to the city have allowed for a very special addition to the center. In order to complete the project, the city submitted a proposal and now that it has been approved, the grant will be sufficient to complete the new center, joining the new and old centers via a construction passageway. I join the city of Rocky Ford in extending our warmest thanks to the Boettcher Foundation.

Furthermore, I would like to offer my thanks to the Boettcher Foundation as a whole. The grant awarded my constituents in Rocky Ford is one of many that have aided projects across the State. Thanks to the foundation, dozens of Colorado programs serving thousands of its citizens have received funding. These programs range from athletic opportunities for disabled youth to housing services to community buildings. Every corner of our great State has at some point been aided by the helping hand of the Boettcher Foundation. We are all the better for it.

As we recognize the Boettcher Foundation and its many contributions, let us remember that it is individuals and groups such as this one that cause America to thrive. Their generosity and good deeds are a credit to the State of Colorado and to the Nation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the good people of Rocky Ford and our friends at the Boettcher Foundation.

FEDERAL COMMITMENT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today all over America our schools are inadequate, overcrowded and literally falling down. In Miami students learn to read and write in temporary trailers. Here in our Nation's capital, schools

have been closed for violating the fire code. In New York City, students dodge falling plaster and attend class in hallways and cafeterias. It is really extraordinary to me after having visited so many of the schools in the metropolitan region of New York that in the United States of America youngsters go to school with plastic actually holding up the ceiling. This, in the most prosperous and advanced Nation in the world. It just does not make any sense.

A 1996 GAO report confirmed the worst. Record numbers of school buildings across America are in disrepair. One-third of all schools serving 14 million students need extensive repairs. About 60 percent of schools need to have roofs, walls or floors fixed. With school enrollment skyrocketing, this problem will only get worse. It is time for the Federal Government to act. This is a local problem that demands a national response. Our school modernization bond proposal will allocate \$19.4 billion for zero interest bonds to fix old schools and build new ones all across the Nation. This is absolutely an essential idea that is creating a partnership between the Federal, State and local governments. The Federal Government should not assume the total responsibility, but we have an obligation to build that partnership. If the Federal Government can help States build prisons and roads, then certainly they should be able to help build schools.

Just look at some of the numbers. Due to the baby boom echo, the children of baby boomers filling the schools, particularly the high schools across the country are once again bulging with students. The demand for school facilities will continue to be high. School enrollment is projected to continue to climb over the next several years, growing from 52.2 million in the 1997-98 school year to 54.3 million by the year 2006-07. With school enrollments rising at the same time that the budgets for building new classrooms have been constrained, overcrowding has become a common problem.

I say to my partners on the other side of the aisle, if we really want to keep down property taxes, then in addition to building roads and highways and bridges and prisons, we have a responsibility to help with our schools. Because of this partnership, it will keep down the local property taxes. This is everywhere.

In California, a 35 percent increase in high school enrollment is projected. In North Carolina, 27 percent increase. In Arizona, 25 percent. In Nevada, 24 percent. In Massachusetts, 23 percent. In Rhode Island, 21 percent. In Georgia, 20 percent. In Virginia, 20 percent. In Texas, 19 percent. And on and on. The bottom line is we have to build schools. The Education Department estimates that 6,000 new schools will have to be built over the next 10 years in response

to this rapid growth in school enrollment.

What do poor building conditions have to do with our students' achievement? According to all the studies that have been done, there is a direct connection. For example, a 1991 study of the District of Columbia public schools found a 10.9 percent gap in scores between students in buildings rated poor and ones rated as excellent, after accounting for other factors. The problem is not just an urban one. Studies in rural Virginia and North Dakota have found similar results.

Recently there was a study published in May 1996 by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University which concluded sufficient data exists to state that the condition of a building does result in a difference in students' scores and action.

Mr. Speaker, this is urgent. Education is the key to the strength of the United States of America. I would hope that we can work together to pass this bill this year, because we are doing it for our youngsters, for our families and our futures.

□ 1415

UNITED STATES DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling statistics you are ever going to see, at least that you are going to see in the next year or two, and I hope it is not repeated, is the fact that teen drug use in the United States has doubled since 1992. Doubled, drug use among teenagers.

That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable for many reasons. Society cannot stand having our young people become more and more involved with narcotics that dull their senses, habituate them, get them involved not only with marijuana, but leading on to harder substances, cocaine, heroin, et cetera, that can lead to life-endangering, if not career-ending types of involvement.

It is not acceptable in the sense of the crime that is involved with drugs and how it permeates society and reaches down to the ghettos, as well as up to the higher-income people. It is a very, very bad situation in our country today.

Many who talk about the drug situation like to put a good face on it, a happy face. I do not think there is a happy face.

Yes, we can say that if you compare drug use overall in the United States to something 10 or 20 years ago, it is overall down. Or we can say it is a little better on the treatment side hither

and yon than it was before. But the reality is among the people we care the most about, among our children, drug use has doubled since 1992, and we have to do something about it.

Now, I am all for having an Office of Drug Policy, and I am all for that Office of National Drug Control Policy having a strategy, and General Barry McCaffrey is someone who I personally admire, and I believe he is very sincere in his efforts to try to work to eradicate the drug problem in this Nation. But I cannot agree that the strategy which he promulgated with the President a couple of weeks ago is adequate.

I have in my hands the national drug control strategy, 1998, a 10-year plan. There are some things in here that are very good. I particularly commend the drug czar's office for establishing criteria that we can measure progress by. It has been missing. We need to do it just like businesses measure progress hither and yon in their business.

We find in this drug plan all kinds of goals and objectives in detail about how we fight the drug scourge with prevention and treatment and so forth. But in the context of getting to the solution, the 10-year plan has some very serious problems to it.

The reality is that it is too shortsighted, in my judgment. We need to come up with a plan that says, yes, we will attack the demand side and the supply side. We are going to have a balanced approach. We have known that for years. We have talked about it for years. But we really have not come to the consensus, either in the Nation or in Congress or in our national leadership, on precisely what it is going to take and how soon we can get the resources it is going to take to actually stop this entire process of drugs coming into our country like they have been recently.

I am disturbed by the fact that in this drug strategy, up front, it says we should no longer talk about fighting the effort against narcotics as a war. This strategy at the very beginning of it says that war is not an appropriate metaphor, that it is misleading. In essence, the administration in producing this plan is saying we can never defeat the scourge of drugs gripping our Nation and killing our youths. Our only hope is to contain it, and the quote from the drug strategy is, to check the spread and improve the prognosis.

By saying this, they are, in my judgment, yielding and waving a white flag in the efforts we have. We should be conducting a war on drugs, and a war on drugs means a strategy that says, here is what we can do to stop it, here is when we are going to do it, here is how we are going to do it, here is the timetable to do it, and yes, this is a 10-year plan.

What is the ultimate goal of the 10-year plan? It is to reduce the availability and use of drugs in the United

States by 50 percent in 10 years. But the teenage drug use in the United States has doubled since 1992, so if we reduce the use by 50 percent in 10 years, we will have only gone back to where we were in 1992. Is that acceptable? I suggest no, it is not acceptable.

In addition, what is meant by the word "availability"? That is a pretty darn broad word. It is defined in here in a way that one might conclude it means the flow of illegal drugs into the United States, but it could also mean law enforcement and a lot of other things that go on to reduce the availability, the opportunity to buy drugs on the streets, I presume.

But nowhere in this drug strategy is there a goal or target that says what our objectives should be to reduce the flow of drugs coming into the United States at our borders or before they get to our borders. That is of paramount importance.

One of the reasons we have so much trouble with our prevention programs and with our law enforcement efforts in fighting narcotics today is because drugs are in more plentiful supply and cheaper than they have ever been. Both cocaine and heroin, in particular, fall into that category.

Heroin, for example, killed more young people in my hometown of Orlando a year or so ago than anywhere else in the United States; more than in Los Angeles, with a population many times the size of Orlando.

In the last two or three weeks, I have seen at least three or four articles in my hometown newspaper about arrests connected with heroin, a couple of them dealing with teenagers in our high schools there, things perhaps unheard of a few years ago being uncommon now.

Why is that? It is because heroin is now coming into the eastern part of the United States from Colombia, and it is purer than ever before, it is better quality and it is cheaper, and we are not really doing anything significant to stop that flow. The same thing can be said in many ways for cocaine and for marijuana and for the other narcotics that we are trying to fight.

That is not to say that Drug Enforcement Administration is not working hard. It is not to say the Coast Guard is not working hard. It is not to say that our State Department and our Defense Department people who are in charge of working in their respective areas are not attempting to do their jobs. It is not to say that Customs is not doing what it is supposed to be doing.

But the reality is the sum of this is insufficient, inadequate, and there is no leadership saying precisely what it is that we need to do and how we are going to do it, to stop the flow of drugs coming in in this alarming amount that has the price so low and the quantity so plentiful, that so many young

people are using it that it is hard to get our arms around it.

All of our experts say we need to reduce the flow of drugs into this country by at least 60 percent, if not more, in order to raise the price up and make it more difficult for young people to buy it and afford it and get it and thereby reduce the pressures at the street level.

That is not the only thing we need to be doing. Again, we need to be educating, we need to be on television. Some of the things suggested in this strategy are good about that. I think we are going to spend quite a few million dollars we have appropriated very soon on television commercials directed at young people to try to discourage them from using drugs.

We need to be involved in other ways, including ways in the workplace, which have been in the past suggested and some employers are doing it, but others are not. We need to get more people to have drug-free workplaces.

We need to spread the word out into the community to reduce this demand and use of drugs by education and every way we possibly can. We need to have better treatment programs and so on.

But when it comes right down to the crux of this, if we continue to inundate our Nation with the quantity that is coming in now, it is not going to be possible to manage this from the demand side alone.

It is my judgment as the Chairman of the House Crimes Subcommittee and a member of the House Intelligence Committee, who looks at these matters regularly, and has for some years, it is my judgment that we should set a goal, and I think it is achievable, set a goal to reduce the flow of drugs into the United States from other source countries, from outside the United States, reduce the flow of drugs by 80 percent within the next two or three years. Why don't we set three years and say 80 percent within three years. You can say, is that realistic, is that achievable, can it be done?

I want to tell you a little bit about why I think it can be done. I went down to Colombia and Peru and Bolivia in December, and I was in Mexico and Panama in the early part of this year, and I visited when I went in each of those countries with the key players at the State Department and with our people involved with the DEA in those countries and our defense attache and with the others who are country team members who are every day on the front lines in those countries trying to assist us in reducing crop production of cocaine and heroine, who are attempting to stop the drug lords in Colombia and elsewhere from shipping drugs this way and so forth.

I spent a little time with each one of them in the evenings talking about this idea, could it be possible in your

country, in Colombia, in Peru, in Bolivia, if you were given the resources and nobody had a restriction on the amount of money involved, nobody told you you could not have this or could not do the other, could you devise a plan that within three years would stop the flow of drugs from this Nation out to the rest of the world by at least 80 percent? Every one of them said yes, we could. Yes, we could.

I asked them if they had ever been tasked to do that? The answer was universally, no.

Well, most of the drugs, more than 50 percent of the cocaine at least, is produced in Peru, about 20 percent in Bolivia, the rest of it in Colombia, most of it refined in Colombia. There is very little or no cocaine produced and distributed from any other sources than those three countries, and almost all of the heroin in the eastern half of the United States comes from Colombia.

So if we could reduce the flow out of each of those countries by 80 percent over the next three years, we would certainly reduce the flow into the United States of those drugs by pretty close to 80 percent, if not 80 percent. In fact, in the case of cocaine, it should be, it should translate directly into that, or more.

You can say, how have we missed the boat on this? Well, I do not think we have. Let us take country by country examples of how you would address that problem.

First of all in Peru, there has been great progress made. In Peru the quantity of coca base which is used to produce cocaine in a refined form, is way down. Peru used to produce about 60 percent of the world's supply of coca used for cocaine.

They grow plants, by the way, in the countries where they grow them, that are no higher than this rostrum. They produce leaves that look like, in my part of the country, camphorberry leaves, little leaves. They strip the leaves off the bushes several times a year, and they then make them into a sort of a liquid base, and goes on to make the basic base shipped out of the country.

You say "they." Who is they? In Peru and Bolivia and Colombia, the people actually doing this are the poor people, the campesinos. They grow this stuff on acreage that is less than one-third of an acre in American terms, they call them hectares down there, and they are the poorest of the poor doing this. They get very low remuneration for doing it. They don't get much money at all.

They produce these leaves and carry them over and create this base by going to what they call a poso pit, the slang locally for a location where they operate to convert these leaves into the first step of making cocaine. All of this is grown in the Amazon regions of those three countries, down in the hot

jungle area. I do not know how many people realize that, but coca plants are grown basically in the jungle, some of it a little higher land than others, but all of it in very thick jungle.

The little plots are cleared out and these poor people grow this stuff. Then they take these leaves and they go near a stream, and they build some 20 foot long, maybe not even that, some 10 foot long trough, a couple feet wide, maybe three or four feet wide at most, very crudely.

They put water in there with the leaves they have carried over in big plastic garbage bags basically, or lawn bags, leaf bags. They dump them in there.

Then they put some sulfuric acid that they brought in, by foot usually, from someplace they have acquired it, usually from the drug dealers, the sources who want them to produce this stuff. And they stomp on it with their feet, sometimes with boots on, sometimes with naked feet, which does not make a lot of sense to me, because sulfuric acid is pretty damaging to the feet.

They do this two or three times over a 24 to 48 hour period. Then they strain off the liquid, and, again, we are talking about really crude operations in the forest, with no refineries or anything like that around. These are temporary shack-type thatch roof things at best set up beside these little streams.

They take this liquid and they put it into a pot, and they mix lime in it, and they make a thicker base, sort of a paste type of substance with it, and then they move it over to another pot and they heat it and cook it and dry it out until they get slabs basically about a foot square, and maybe a inch or two thick, and they wrap it in a tight cellophane heavy material, and they carry it out, their kids carry it out usually, sometimes they do themselves, either out of the jungle by foot to a road or a highway, or, once they get there, into a vehicle, hiding it in compartments under the seat, the back seat of the vehicle or wherever it may be. They might take space out above an axle or wherever they can place this, and they smuggle it to some site, where it is either going to be flown in the case of Peru into Colombia for refinement in a more sophisticated laboratory, or, in the case of Bolivia, near the City of Santa Cruz, where most of these laboratories are for refinement there in that country's case.

At any rate, the point is that in Peru we have made a lot of progress in reducing the crops that are grown and stopping these folks, these poor people who produce these little plots of cocaine, or actually produce plots of coca plants and then go produce the coca base, we have seen in the past two years that President Fujimori has had a new policy in effect, a reduction of 40 percent of the coca crop in Peru.

□ 1430

That is down from about 125,000 hectares, that is the way they measure their land, 125,000 hectares, to about 68,000 hectares during the beginning of this year. That is a dramatic reduction in 2 years. Why has that happened? What has been done to cause that to happen?

One very simple thing happened. President Fujimori of Peru decided on a policy of shooting down all of the private planes that are flying this coca base, once it has gotten to them, out of the country and into Columbia for refining in the laboratories. That policy alone has caused all of this disruption.

There are other things going on. There is a crop eradication program that the United States supports, and there are a lot of men and women in country in the Peruvian businesses and in the world of our foreign service who are working very hard every day to go out and literally destroy crops by hand in Peru, where they take a machete and whack the plant down and kill it.

But the crop eradication alone would not have done this. We have been doing that for a long time. It is the policy of getting tough, and sending a message to those who are attempting to do this, that you are going to lose your life, we are not just going to be kidding around about this anymore. If you are going to be transshipping across country lines out of Peru in a private commercial plane, which is the way most of this goes, you are in real trouble.

Now we have begun the process, in cooperation with the Peruvian Government, of helping them with riverine traffic on all those rivers out there, to stop the possibility that some of this stuff is going out by way of river through the Amazon and so forth. It is effective. It can work.

In order to succeed to an even greater extent, all that is really required is the continued effort on the same track that it has been on, and the determination of the leadership of the Government of Peru and some more air support, some air surveillance, some radar in the air, so we can keep up with these planes and give more support on the riverine program. We need to keep up what we are doing. But it is working in Peru.

In Bolivia, where about 20 percent of the coca crop is grown, the Government of Bolivia has just changed hands last fall. I think it was in August, to be precise. In Bolivia we have a wonderful opportunity now, working with this new government which is dedicated to eradicating the coca production and the cocaine production in that country. As I said earlier, 20 percent is produced there. It is actually refined, in Bolivia's case. There are ways of going about attacking the problem there very similar to what was done in Peru.

I believe that with the support of the United States Government, an effort

clearly can be done to make it unsafe for these folks to be transiting and trafficking the base narcotic from the field, where it is grown and put into this paste as I have described, by the poor people, the campesinos, into the city, in the area of Santa Cruz, Bolivia, where it is refined. There is only one road that goes that way, and it is a long way. It seems to me that is a choke point, and we could stop a lot of the traffic along that road.

It also seems to me that there is only one road into Brazil and one main highway into Argentina. There is no reason why we could not choke off the traffic leaving Santa Cruz with a more refined product, and with greater information and equipment, skills, et cetera, I believe that the Government of Bolivia will be able to do the same or better than the Government of Peru over the next couple of years in reducing the production of both the coca base from the plants, as well as the finished cocaine and shipping it out.

It is not important what I believe. What is important is that in both cases, this is what our American, the United States Embassy country team dealing with anti-narcotics believes in each of those countries. They believe it passionately and deeply.

In the case of Bolivia, they say we just need a couple of more planes, we need a couple of more trucks, we need a little more of this or that equipment, it is not terribly expensive; maybe a couple of the x-ray machines, like they have on the borders between Mexico and the United States.

What about Colombia, you say? That is the big, bad apple down in Latin America. We know that is where most of the cocaine production heads north from. That is where most of the laboratories are. The same is true there, though it is more complicated.

In Colombia, the growing regions in the South, they not only grow there but they take in the Peruvian crop and refine it in laboratories that are located in that same region. This is all an Amazon Basin region of Colombia. We have the cooperation, despite some of the difficulties we have had in recent years, we have the cooperation of the Colombian Government. They are going to have a new election this spring. We need to be sure that we continue to get that cooperation, but it appears that it is likely that we will.

The Colombian National Police, headed by General Serrano, has done a terrific job in the face of all odds in going out and trying to destroy crops, trying to destroy laboratories, trying their darndest to arrest the drug lords in Colombia. Some of that has been very successful, though little publicized up here in the States as to what has been done.

The reality is that that portion of the countryside where most of this activity is going on is largely under the

control of rebel groups, guerrilla groups, who have been around for many years in Columbia. The shorthand name for them, they call them a FARC, FARC, for a Spanish name. That is an acronym, FARC. This group of revolutionaries used to be affiliated with the Communist movement in years past. Back in the days of the Sandinistas when they were active in Nicaragua, they were sympathetic in the same causes.

There have been human rights violations against this group in the past by the Colombian military. Our State Department and others say that is so. There has been a general resistance to being involved with this group, or supporting Colombian efforts to suppress it.

I want to tell the Members, there is a big problem, because the FARC control that region. They are engaged in gaining all of the money and resources they have to continue to do their operations by running a protection racket for the drug lords, for the drug kingpins in Columbia. The drug kingpins pay them money to go and defend and protect the fields where the coca is grown, and to protect the cocaine laboratories in Columbia.

The FARC then go buy all kinds of arms, AK-47s and so forth, on the world black market for arms, and they do exactly what I said. They go about protecting those fields and those laboratories from the efforts of the Colombian National Police to resolve the matter. As a result, many, many people have been killed who are law enforcement officials of the Colombian National Police, trying to go in and destroy the laboratories and the crops.

The results of that is that there are areas of the country they do not even go into because they cannot reach it. Some of it is technical, because airstrips are not adequately finished in areas close in. Some is because we do not have the right type of helicopters in Columbia to do the job at the longer ranges necessary.

A lot, and most of it, frankly, is because the guerrillas, the FARC, are out there threatening to kill anybody who comes in there, and have the power to do that. The Columbia National Police are not the military in Columbia.

What is it that it takes to resolve this matter in Columbia? It takes the United States Government being willing to put the resources into training and equipping the Colombian military and assisting them in destroying the FARC, to end their control of the region where all of this drug activity is taking place, and then continue and step up our support to the Colombian National Police to go in and destroy all these laboratories, and to our State Department effort, which is a crop eradication effort; they spray, as opposed to hand destruction of crops in Columbia for cocaine, to provide

enough planes and enough equipment to go in there and do the job all at one time, not mess around and drag this out for 10 more years, or whatever, just go in and get the job done. It can be done. It may take a few months to get the equipment in order, it may take a few months to train the Colombian military adequately so they can go out and do their job, but it can be done.

I hear people talking to me up here in the two bodies I work with, the other body and this one, about the fear if we train the Colombian military, that, gosh, they have a bad track record. They are going to come back and create all kinds of human rights violations.

I think it is our job to do everything in our power to see to it that they do not commit atrocities. I believe that it is the Government of Columbia's desire that that not be the case. I am convinced by our people on the ground in Columbia that is indeed true, that we have the best climate we may have ever had in modern times for succeeding in gaining the kind of cooperation we need inside the Colombian military and its government to avoid those kinds of atrocities.

But make no mistake about it, the risks of being involved in having some hazard of that sort take place is worth it. That does not mean we condone it, it does not mean we support it, it does not mean we do not condemn it or do everything we can to prevent it, but we need to protect first and foremost the lives of the children of America. We need to protect the lives of our children from the drug presence that is here in this country, from the drugs being produced and shipped, and the sale of those drugs largely controlled by the Colombian drug lords who are running the country in the southern part of Columbia by the use of these rebels.

We need to have those rebels destroyed, and we need to have the crops destroyed and the drug lords destroyed. It can be done without the United States military going in. It can be done if we will simply equip and train the Colombian military and give them the resources that they need. I believe that should be done sooner, rather than later.

In addition to that, though, and even before that occurs, if it does occur in the next couple of years, we can make other progress in Columbia in a similar fashion as we have made in Peru and Bolivia. There is the possibility of a shutdown policy in Columbia. There is a mountain range that runs in Columbia around two-thirds or better of the northern and western part of the country. You have to cross this mountain range to get to the coast with your cocaine that is then going to be shipped by boat or however it comes to the United States or to Mexico.

A lot of the people we have, once this stuff gets to sea it is shipped in little

vessels that are hard to detect. They get out over open water in the Pacific going up to Mexico, they get out over open water in the Caribbean in the Gulf of Mexico, and it is very hard for our Coast Guard or our Navy to detect these little vessels out there. A lot of it comes to our country as a result of that, or at least it gets to Mexico, where it is filtered in on that side, and certainly gets to Puerto Rico and the islands and comes on to the States that way.

It so happens that you have to get the crop in a refined condition, which is done in the laboratories in southern Columbia, across those mountains. The way they cross those mountains is not by roads. There are not really any good roads going across those mountains. The way you cross those mountains is by small private plane, small little commercial planes, just like they do in Peru to get the crop to Columbia for final refinement.

If President Fujimori has been successful in Peru, why cannot the Government of Columbia be just as successful in Columbia in shooting down those planes as they identify them and as they begin to leave that country, or at least as they begin to go across the mountains inside Columbia to get to the coast in the first place?

There are a lot of other details that perhaps I would be better off not going into for national security reasons, but we have the ability, from information and intelligence, to know a lot about what happens in Columbia and a lot about the trafficking that is going on there. What we do not have is the leadership to put together the plan that says this is the way we are going to do it, and then go carry it out.

I say the leadership. Our country team in Columbia, who is working in narcotics, has the plan. What we need is for them to be asked for their plan by those higher up in authority in our United States Government, in the executive branch. We need for that plan to be acted upon. We need for the administration to come forward and say to the United States Congress, here is our shopping list, and here is our 3-year timetable. Here is what it is going to take in Columbia to do the job. This is our 3-year plan to literally destroy the drug trafficking in Columbia, to destroy the cocaine production in Columbia. Here is what it is.

We have not seen that plan, but it could come up, and I have a pretty good idea of what ought to be in that plan.

In addition to cocaine, Columbia produces heroin. That is a new thing. Columbia did not used to produce it. Most of the heroin coming in the United States, as most of the world's heroin, used to come from the Golden Triangle over in the Burma area of the world, way over in the Far Eastern part of the world. But now, in recent years, we

have found it is even more pure than that, the gold heroin being produced in Columbia. The poppies are grown in Columbia, in the mountains, and the refinement is done there.

Heroin is shipped in much smaller quantities than cocaine. It goes by commercial airline, often. People swallow little packets of heroin and bring it into the airports in the United States virtually undetectable. If one of those packets burst, they are dead, but they are paid a lot of money, so they do it. The reality is that it is much more difficult to interdict the heroin once it is refined and is on its way than it is to stop the large quantities, metric tons, of cocaine.

We have probably 600 or 700 or more metric tons of cocaine in its refined product form coming out of Bolivia and Columbia directed towards the United States every year. We do not interdict very much of it, but we know it has to come in large quantities when it gets on boats. Or if people are bringing it in, we will see somebody be interdicted with a very large quantity of it, a very visible, sizeable white powder substances.

Heroin, again, is small in quantity, much more difficult to interdict at that level. But we can do something that is a lot easier, in the case of heroin, than cocaine, that solves the problem. We can destroy the poppy crops more easily than we can destroy the cocaine or the coca crops.

The reason for that is they are grown in little plots in the mountains, they are grown as annuals. These are plants that come up, and they are pretty flowers, if you have ever seen them grow. There are various types. Some are not dangerous, but the ones, of course, that grow in Columbia in those mountains, as some in Mexico, are very dangerous.

But we have the ability to eradicate, to spray, to do it by hand or otherwise. What is missing in Columbia, frankly, is the size and type of helicopter and aircraft that can go up into the mountains at the elevations where these crops are grown and protect the eradicators as they eradicate those poppy crops.

They can do that, they can spot them fairly easily. It is very easy to detect those crops. There is no reason why, if we provide the equipment to Columbia, that this cannot be done and done very quickly, more quickly than the coca eradication. So it is not as big a problem as some people make it out to be.

Does that mean we can cease and desist and once and for all it is gone, and you will never have to deal with it again? Probably not. I would be naive to think that.

□ 1445

But we can put a plan in place to literally stop it, to destroy those crops, and we can have a continuous plan then that is a lot easier to do, of keep-

ing it suppressed, than it is to get it done to start with in the first place.

There is no reason why for a minimal sustenance resource amount we cannot see the program continue to suppress the growth of poppy and the production of heroin in Colombia for many years to come, if we just go in now and do the right thing by providing the resources and the equipment and follow the game plan.

Again, our in-country embassy antinarcotics team knows how to do this, but it is not being done. Nobody is doing it. No leadership in Washington has asked and tasked them to provide that plan to them, other than of course some of us in Congress who have been inquiring about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues may sense my frustration and why I am out here today talking with them about it. We in Congress should not be the ones to develop all the plans that are done and to drive this issue. It should be driven by the President of the United States and this administration. It is an executive branch function, primarily. The management of all of these diverse programs and interests to try to focus on drugs is definitely within the executive prerogative.

But I can tell my colleagues that every day that passes and I see a plan like this one, this drug strategy that was promulgated a couple of weeks ago, that calls for a relatively timid approach to reduce drug use and availability in this country by a mere 50 percent in 10 years, every time I see something like this, and this is obviously current, I am moved to come forward and say congressional leadership is necessary. It has got to come from Congress if it is not going to come from the White House.

So that is why I am out here, and I believe that we as Members of the U.S. House have an obligation to the American people to do everything we can to organize and force a plan and the implementation of that plan to reduce the flow of these drugs into the United States by at least an 80 percent reduction of that flow over the next 2 or 3 years. If we follow this path, I am convinced that we can do it.

There are other things that need to be done. We need to have radar planes that are flying the region that the Department of Defense does not currently have. We need to have tracking planes, once they have picked up on vessels or airplanes that they believe from intelligence or otherwise are loaded with narcotics, to be able to chase these planes and vessels, ships. We do not have that surveillance now.

Mr. Speaker, we should have 24-hour, around-the-clock radar covering Bolivia, Peru, Colombia and the waters that go through the Pacific, the Gulf and the Caribbean along the coastline of that part of South America, including Venezuela, where these drugs are

leaving and coming and going from. There is no reason why we cannot do that either. But we do not begin to deal with this in a fraction of the amount of surveillance time that would be required to do the job in the 24-hour coverage of which I speak.

There is no reason why we cannot do that if we put our mind to it. But one of the reasons there is a problem with all of this is that a large measure of our counternarcotics effort comes under the control of the Department of Defense. I have no criticism with that. That is where it should be. The Southern Command, with General Wilhelm, which is now located in Miami, is primarily responsible from a military perspective for all our antinarcotics efforts, at least in this hemisphere.

There is a structure in place, a new architecture that the General is working on. I am pleased with what I have seen. He is working there, but he is working with one arm tied behind his back. I will tell my colleagues why. It is because in the Department of Defense mission priorities fighting drugs is way down at the bottom of the list. The resources of DOD have been cut back so much for doing the tasks that most who are involved in our national security areas believe are needed to do the things that are important, that drugs come in last and they get very few resources. They do not get the planes. They do not have the AWACS or the P3 platforms that they need. And they do not get the other equipment that they need and the support that is necessary at Southern Command to do this job.

One thing the President of the United States could do is get with Secretary of Defense Cohen and say let us move the list a little bit around and rearrange the chairs and make fighting the war on drugs meaningful by raising its priority under the mission of DOD to a higher level than where it is today. Some may say that is simple. It could be done tomorrow morning. And of course it is simple. It could be done tomorrow morning, but I do not think that is likely.

There are four basic missions that the military has. One is the major national security obligation of protecting us against all of our enemies that might be aggressive towards us. That is not anything anybody would wish to reduce to a second rung. That is number one. That is what our military, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard are all about. We need to keep it there.

Number two is peacekeeping. That means things like Bosnia. There is a lot of debate about whether we should have been in Bosnia, whether we should still be there. As long as we are there, all of us are going to be supportive of the activities that are going on there. But there is a major debate over the degree to which the United States mili-

tary should be used to be a peacekeeper all over the world putting out fires. That is the number two mission.

The number three mission is readiness and exercises, training exercises to keep people going, keep the training at the proper level for flying and so forth. I do not think that is a bad mission either.

But the fourth mission, there are only four, is the antinarcotics mission to fight drugs, to fight the flow of drugs coming into this country from abroad. That is way down there and it has just about dropped off. When they are at the last rung, they are way off.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me at least that fighting drugs should be the number 3 priority for the Department of Defense, ahead of exercises and training. I think when we consider the lives being lost of our young people, if we want to fight a war on drugs, it ought to be the number two priority ahead of peacekeeping. It ought to be that national security is number one and then right after that it should be fighting and winning the war on drugs.

It should be a war. It should be put on wartime footing. We should have the Department of Defense supplying every plane, every man, every piece of equipment and every bit of intelligence that we need to do that. The CIA should be devoting whatever resources are required to provide information to that drug-fighting machine with regard to what the drug lords are doing, who is producing what, where the shipments are going and how they are going. We should not spare a nickel in doing this job.

If we simply change the priorities in the DOD, in the Department of Defense, what a world of difference that would make to be able to properly equip General Wilhelm's troops and what he is trying to do in Southern Command. It is very difficult. He is responsible for an awful lot.

The same thing is true of the Coast Guard. They are underfunded and undersupported in what they are trying to do. The Coast Guard is in charge, with Admiral Kramek, of our transit zones interdiction. That is all the stuff at sea and in the air between South America and the United States. They do not have near enough to do it.

We should seal off the island of Puerto Rico from drugs. A lot of people know that the drugs come through Puerto Rico in large quantities now to the eastern part of the United States. There is no reason we cannot seal the island off.

The problem is not Puerto Ricans transiting drugs or dealing in drugs. The problem is drugs coming into Puerto Rico. It is part of the United States. Once they are there, there is no customs to come here. There is no check of a ship or a plane. Puerto Ricans are American citizens. It is just like being in Texas or Florida and ship-

ping drugs or any other piece of equipment to wherever else; the same type of restrictions, very little or none.

We have no reason not to and every reason to seal off the island of Puerto Rico and all the other areas of the United States from drug trafficking. The Coast Guard has that responsibility and we do not provide the equipment, the planes, the radar, and the technical support that they need to do that, the manpower and the dollars. We need to do that.

We need to provide whatever it takes to do this job. This plan, this drug strategy plan has some nice words in it. It has a 10-year goal in it. Some of this stuff is good, but it does not begin to do the job. It does not set the basic target and it does not provide the road map to get it done, and the budget that goes along with this plan that has been submitted is paltry compared to what needs to be given.

Obviously, we need to have the explicit details of here is how we are going to do it over the next 3 years to cut the supply by 80 percent. And we need to know what equipment is needed and what manpower and what follow-on is needed and if we are going to provide more helicopters, and we are going to have to do that to the Latin American effort. We are going to have to provide more planes, these radar-type planes, and more manpower. We are going to have to provide the readiness and the maintenance. We are going to have to have a budget stream and it is going to have to be logical and somebody is going to have to decide what the DOD is going to have it in. Which one is going to have that equipment? Is the State Department going to have these planes, and Customs that group? The coordination has to come from this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have not forgotten Mexico and I realize it continues to be a very difficult issue for us. I happen to be one who believes that Mexican Government leaders at the very top, the President and their Attorney General in particular, are indeed trying to cooperate and do their best job. But there are big problems in Mexico's structure. We have known about that for some time and we know that many of the states of Mexico, like the States of the United States, have corruption in the state governments; that the police in those states are often involved with narcotics trafficking. We do not know to what degree, but it is a fairly high percentage.

There are going to have to be some structural, systemic reforms in Mexico that are going to take a number of years to accomplish. But the Mexican Government has recently passed new money-laundering laws and made extradition agreements with the United States. We will now see some people come out to be tried in the United States who are drug lords. The military in Mexico is destroying poppy

crops in the mountain ranges where they do grow black tar heroin, which is a large part of the heroin in the western United States.

But Mexico does not grow a single bit of cocaine. There is no coca plant in Mexico. No refineries of cocaine in Mexico. And the biggest single group of drug problems that I hear about are problems related to cocaine and heroin, the two of them combined.

There is no reason why one extra ounce of cocaine should be allowed to get to Mexico to be distributed here by their drug lords. That is what is happening now. The Mexicans, these drug lords in Mexico are the ones who are doing the retailing in the United States, at least the western half. The Colombians take their cocaine to Mexico and wholesale it to the Mexicans and the Mexicans retail it here.

Our borders are porous. We need to continue to beef up our Southwest border and we are doing a decent job, but not doing nearly enough. It is not smart in many ways.

When we start looking at prioritization of putting our resources, the best use of our resources to really stop the flow of drugs into the United States is to put it before and below Mexico. Stop the drugs from ever getting to Mexico in the first place. The problems of Mexico are going to be around for a while. We need to work those problems. We do have the cooperation of the President and the Attorney General. Progress is being made. But we have to recognize that it is going to take a while, and if we are going to stop the flow of 80 percent of the drugs coming into this Nation in the next 3 years, which is possible to do, the place to do it is to draw that line south of Mexico and to make it work and to provide the resources that are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by saying that again we need a balanced approach in fighting narcotics. We need to have a true war on drugs, though. We need to work on the supply side and the demand side. While my conversation today has been about the supply side, we need to put emphasis as well equally on the demand side to get our young people better educated.

But today teenage drug use in the United States is double what it was in 1992. Double what it was. That is absolutely intolerable. It is unacceptable and we should be ashamed of it. Not only should we be ashamed, but we should be out there using every ounce of strength to destroy the pathways of those drugs getting to our young people.

Unless we reduce the quantity of drugs coming into the United States by at least 60 to 80 percent, we cannot drive the price of drugs up that are really cheap today in our cities and reduce the quantity to a manageable level, so that our local law enforce-

ment can really be meaningful in its job and so that our local community leaders can be meaningful and get real results in their education and treatment efforts.

We have to reduce the onslaught of this overwhelming amount of narcotics coming in here, particularly cocaine and heroin from South America. The way to do that is to set that target and set a goal that is realistic and achievable.

I have suggested today that that be a target of 3 years to reduce by 80 percent the amount of drugs coming into the United States. It is a target that every one of our antinarcotics in-country team believes, in the three principal countries involved, that is Colombia, Peru and Bolivia. And it is something that this administration has yet to embrace in this strategy.

We as a Congress need to embrace that strategy. We need to force the resources, if necessary, on this administration to do the job. It can be done. It must be done. We need to provide those resources to those who can do it for us in the State Department, in the Defense Department, in the Justice Department with DEA, and in every other way that is necessary in those source countries where this is affecting.

The leaders in Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru at the very top of their governments are ready, willing and able now to cooperate. We better take advantage of it while we have the opportunity to stop the scourge of drugs affecting our young people. Let us go and give them the resources they need.

It is a first step. It is a logical step. It is not a 10-year plan; it is a 3-year plan. And I challenge my colleagues to join with me in an effort to really have a true, for the first time in our history, true war on drugs.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it was just a few weeks ago that the President of the United States in this very chamber said that we ought to reserve every dollar, every penny of a budgetary surplus and put it into Social Security. What was interesting about that to me is that basically what he was talking about, what he was outlining was the larger question of how we are going to save Social Security. In other words, if we take every penny of surplus and put that money where it belongs, which is in the Social Security Trust Fund, rather than borrowing from it, what we have done is we have taken a first step towards saving Social Security. But what that does, because of the way the budget works in Washington, D.C., what

that would actually mean would be a pay-down of the national debt, which would be very good for Social Security, but again only a first step. To me what it raises is that larger question of how in fact do we save Social Security.

Some people have said, yes, it is a good first step to put every dollar of Social Security tax into the Social Security Trust Fund, but the larger question is, since that does not affect the 70 million baby-boomers that begin retiring in 2012, and since that is ultimately what we have to deal with, what we ought to do is look at cutting current benefits for current retirees.

I do not think that that is at all a realistic option. When I talk to seniors along the coast of Myrtle Beach, along the coast of South Carolina, what they say to me is the idea of cutting current benefits is crazy, that Social Security is very important to each of their lives, and that that is not the way you are going to save Social Security.

Other people have said, do you know what you ought to do is, you ought to raise payroll taxes on young people. And yet overwhelmingly what I hear from people across my district at home in South Carolina is that that is not a realistic idea, that you can only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip. And what they are saying is that they are squeezed. They are struggling to make a mortgage payment, to make a car payment, to provide for dollars for kids' education, and that the idea raising the payroll tax just is not the way to do it.

Other people say the way we ought to look at saving Social Security is by freezing it. In other words, we ought to just fossilize it, leave it alone. We do not touch it. We leave it in a corner. Well, that would be nice. It is something I wish we could do. But the fact, again, is that we have got 70 million baby-boomers that start to retire in 2012. That is no fault of the designers of Social Security. It is no fault of anybody in the past, but is something that is coming our way, and we ought to, rather than simply freezing and looking at the problem coming in our direction, do something about it, which is what the President of the United States had said in the first step being let us reserve every dollar surplus towards Social Security.

I think the bigger question, if we are not going to cut current benefits, which is not an option, if we are not going to raise payroll taxes, which is not an option, and if we are not going to freeze, standing in the corner, sort of fossilizing it the way the dinosaurs went, that only leaves one other option for saving Social Security. This other option I think ties straight back to what Senator BOB KERREY, over on the Senate side, a Democrat, is talking about. He says, you have got to have a real rate of return, a real return on assets, if we are going to save Social Security over the next 50 years.

We cannot save Social Security by having it offered to young people today at a suboptimal return. If it is only going to return to them a negative rate of return or a 1 percent rate of return over the course of their lives, we can be assured that Social Security as we know it will disappear over the next 150 years because the consensus in America is not going to be for a sustained rate of return of zero or 1 percent. So I think that the only option in saving Social Security is letting one earn more on their Social Security investment.

The trustees have said, if we do nothing, Social Security begins to run shortfalls in 2012, it begins to run, basically run out of money in 2029; that the average rate of return for everybody working and paying into the system is about 1.9 percent; and that for people born after 1940, the rate of return is actually negative. Now, if you earn a negative rate of return, or if you earn a 1 percent rate of return, you do not end up with a whole lot at the end of the one's working lifetime.

This idea of rate of return is very, very powerful in people's lives. If you take two 20,000-per-year workers, in other words, one fellow earns 20,000 and another fellow earns 20,000, they both go to work at exactly the same age, say they begin work at age 25, and they work until they are 65. If one earns 1.9 percent on your rate of return based on present Social Security taxes, you end up with \$175,000 in the bank.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon, I expect to be joined by other women Members of Congress. I have already been joined by my distinguished cochair of the women's caucus here in the Congress, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). We have come because this is a special month. It is called women's history month. We who are Members of Congress are not historians, however. While we exalt in women's special history in this country and acknowledge the need to use this month to make Americans more aware of the vital role that women have played in the country's history, we have an additional obligation, we who serve in the Congress, and that is to keep people current on what it is that this Congress is doing for women and for families. For now 21 years the women's caucus has taken as its special obligation to secure the rights and needs of women and their families.

I am going to say something about the work of the women's caucus be-

cause I believe that much of that work is done behind the scenes and women's history month is a good point to let Members and others know of the history that is being made in this body for women and for families. Before I am through, indeed in just a few minutes, I am going to hand it off to my cochair, the Republican cochair of the caucus, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and then I will come back to say something further.

Last year was a landmark year for the women in Congress. We are 50 strong now. We know that that is nothing to write home about if you consider that there are 440 Members of this body, but it does mean that there has been progress in this body since there was hardly a woman to be found among the Members. And that was the case 21 years ago.

Last year in celebrating our 20th anniversary, we had the first dinner we have ever had because we thought when you get to be 20 years old, you ought to do something special, and we had that in a beautiful Federal building downtown, a historic structure. President Clinton, First Lady Hillary Clinton, both attended the dinner and spoke, and the first woman ever to be Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, was the featured speaker, and because women like to have fun, Sweet Honey in the Rock came to sing for the women and men who were gathered there.

What we do most of the time, however, is not to celebrate. What we do most of the time is to fix upon some priorities from among the many that confront the country every year affecting women and families. Mrs. JOHNSON and I thought that on the 20th anniversary of the caucus, we ought to look at the great progress we have made and think about how we should proceed in the future.

We looked at what milestones had been accomplished. I have to tell Members, without detailing all of them during the time we have this afternoon, that they are most impressive, 20 years of concrete achievements.

To give you just a feel, a few examples. Women in Congress are particularly proud of what we have done for women's health. Women's health was a submerged and neglected field when the women's caucus was born. Today, however, women's health is an issue that women and men in this body can take real pride in. Women are now included in clinical trials. Women had the great neglected conditions, but now osteoporosis and breast cancer are among the conditions that the Congress has given a particular time and attention to.

We are beginning to focus on a real sleeper issue in women's health. If I were to ask the average person what kills more women than any other condition, there would probably be some

conditions in the cancer category that people would come forward with because there is so much said about this disease. But the fact is that it is heart disease that kills most women. We need to look closely at heart disease in women to see what it has in common and how it is different from heart disease in men.

Beyond health, and there are a dozen conditions and avenues in health that the women's caucus has brought alive in its 20 years, but I would also cite the Family Medical and Leave Act. This opportunity for people to take uncompensated time off for a serious health need has been a godsend to hundreds of thousands of families already, and it was just signed in 1992. It is a landmark piece of legislation. It leaves us behind most industrialized countries because most industrialized countries give some form of compensated leave for family and medical needs, but we are getting there.

There is, of course, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, to name another of the great achievements of the women's caucus. When I was having my children, pregnancy was not even covered by health insurance plans, and if it was covered at all, it was covered in a very small amount compared to other conditions. A woman could be dismissed because of pregnancy. This, of course, was discrimination based on pregnancy, and I was Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission at a time when we believed that pregnancy discrimination was, of course, covered by title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. A decision from the Supreme Court interpreted title VII not to cover pregnancy, however, and it fell to this body to make it clear that title VII should cover pregnancy, and the landmark Pregnancy Discrimination Act was passed. There is no question that women's ability to move as they now must in the workplace would have been severely hindered without the work of this body on the Pregnancy Discrimination Act.

If I could name just one more among many pieces of legislation that are hallmarks of the 20 years of women in the Congress, the Domestic Violence Act, this is another piece of legislation that it took years to enact, but which everyone now embraces as a landmark act. Domestic violence crosses all manner of boundaries in our society, and women have been left without help or assistance, with the focus of the Congress on criminal violence. This body opened itself to understanding that some of the worst violence occurs inside the home, and that more women are murdered by partners and husbands than by strangers. And so the Domestic Violence Act was passed.

Before speaking further about the work that the Congress is doing led by women Members of Congress to make history and not simply celebrate women's history month, I would like to

turn to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON. I turn to Mrs. JOHNSON, with whom I work side by side, sister to sister, one party or the other notwithstanding. We work together, we believe, as a model of how bipartisanship can and should work in this body. And we believe that the women's caucus is the best example of bipartisanship in the Congress, and we have lots of concrete results to show for what good bipartisanship can do notwithstanding difference in party.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), Republican cochair of the women's caucus.

□ 1515

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from D.C. (Ms. NORTON) and, indeed, I am proud to serve with my colleague as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues because it has made an enormous difference to restructuring the law over the years to recognize the needs of women and the rights of women to be free and equal participants in our democracy.

We are all blessed to live in a land where individual freedom, individual responsibility, equal opportunity and equal justice are the principles that underlie our government. But those ideals cannot be realized unless they are reflected in the law and, indeed, the law changes and moves and has to be amended and reformed as our understanding of what it means to be free and equal changes.

And so it took almost 100 years, well, I guess it was a good 70 years from the time that women really organized to get the vote at a tea party in Seneca Falls before they actually gained the right to vote in a Nation whose underlying document says we are all free and equal and that we believe in self-government. So it does take time.

And today, as we use this special order to kick off Women's History Month, I would like to just talk a little bit about some of the major changes in the structure of law that governs us, that both reflect women's demand to be free and equal citizens in our great Nation, but also have enabled women to do so.

Many of us remember the days before Title IX when women did not have any right to play intercollegiate sports. There was simply no money in it for it, and all the sports budget went to men and all the scholarships went to male athletes. Today, we have women competing on teams in the Olympics, in a great variety of sports, specifically because the Congress of the United States passed Title IX that guaranteed to women equal access to sports opportunities.

That changed the physical education programs of our grammar schools, of our high schools and, very impor-

tantly, of our colleges. And it is for that sole reason alone, that change in Title IX under our education laws, that we as a Nation are competing in the Olympics in many, many sports and winning many gold medals.

The equality that women have achieved, not quite, but we are moving in that direction, in the arena of sports has been reflected also in their opportunity for higher education. And we see an increasing number, in fact a very great explosion in the number of women who are lawyers and doctors and engineers and experts of all kinds, having graduated from college, having had access to the same education that men in our society have had access to many moons before.

So our education statutes, as they were written, and rewritten then, have been a bridge over which women have traveled to gain the real equality that comes from the individual equality that comes from equal access to educational opportunity.

Other areas of great achievement are in the areas of health research, and the Congress Women's Caucus has been a leader in the area of health research and women, not only to focus new research dollars on the areas of women's health, the diseases that were most threatening to women, because they were not getting nearly the research attention that the diseases that threatened men were receiving, but also to change the way we do health research so that research was focused equally on women with heart disease as well as men with heart disease; black women as well as white women; black men as well as white men; ethnic diversity, racial diversity and both genders in all of our research studies, in all of our clinical studies, so that knowledge advanced not just about cardiac disease in men but about cardiac disease in a diverse population in a free society.

So the Congress Women's Caucus led that effort to change the way we do clinical trials, to change the way we do health research, as well as to include at the top of the Nation's health agenda those diseases that were most threatening to the lives of women.

And in the area of retirement security, we simply had to change the law so that as a man earned a right to a pension over the years, he could not sign away his wife's right to a pension after his death without her knowledge or permission. So through the law we enhanced women's opportunity for retirement security as we enhanced women's opportunity to equal educational opportunity and as we have in many areas enhanced women's opportunities in the workplace to equal earning power.

On this issue of retirement security, our first efforts were to make sure that a spouse could not sign away his wife's right to retirement, a small retirement pension; and thereafter to follow that

with a homemakers' IRA and other things to equalize the opportunity for women, both women who were married to workers and women who worked, to have the equal opportunity to prepare for a secure and economically adequate retirement.

But we also have had to change the law in many other areas to assure women's equal treatment under the law.

So in the area of family violence, when I first was elected to public office, and now that goes back many years at the State level in the '70s, it was all right for a man to beat his wife. It was not all right for him to beat his neighbor's wife. He could be actually arrested and put in jail if he beat his neighbor's wife but if he beat his own wife, he could not be charged in the same way.

And that is because way, way back, women were men's property. And our free society, in spite of our Constitution, in spite of our beliefs that we were all equal and free, was slow to apply that concept of equality to the concept of violence. So today if a man beats his wife he will be treated just the same as if he beat his neighbor's wife. And wives are equally protected against violence with any other woman not related by marriage to a man.

So in the area of health, in the area of retirement security, in the area of violence, in the area of education, in the area of work force participation, women have made tremendous strides. But there is more to be done. The challenges ahead of us are real and we must achieve them if women in America are to achieve real equality of opportunity, real freedom and real personal responsibility, and in the equal justice under law.

In the future, Federal day care policy must not discriminate between the benefits we provide to women who have to pay for out-of-home care and the benefits we provide to women in the same economic bracket, the same earning bracket who provide that care to their children at home.

We have to better recognize in a society where research has shown that development from zero to 3 is so crucial, we have to provide a day care policy that does not discriminate against the parent caregiver. So we have much work to do in day care.

But the Congress Women's Caucus has led the battle and won the battle for ever more money into the day care component of welfare reform and in the day care support that we provide working parents. But we have a long way to go in developing a nondiscriminatory policy that simply supports women in the very, very important work of raising children, and particularly in those critical years from zero to three.

We have a long way to go in assuring that women have equal economic opportunity. And while we have made a

lot of progress in some areas, 47 percent of the work force is female but only 5 percent is senior management. Seventy-five percent of those working women hold low-paying jobs with little security. Very few, for example, are successful in the skill trades.

In fact, of all the areas, that is perhaps the area of lowest female achievement. Only .8 percent of the Nation's 1.2 million carpenters are women; only 1.3 percent of the Nation's plumbers and steamfitters and pipefitters are women; and only .7 percent of our mechanics are women. And yet those are jobs that are well paying; those are skill jobs that pay \$23 to \$27 an hour. And these are areas of nontraditional work where women need the right, if their skills and interest lead them, to participate on an equal basis.

Finally, we have enormous challenges in terms of workplace policy. The gentlewoman from D.C. has talked about the leadership of the Congress Women's Caucus and the work of the Congress to provide family and medical leave and more equitable treatment of pregnant women. We also have to go further than that.

I believe we need to provide protection for women who want to change, or men for that matter, who want to take time and a half off instead of time-and-a-half pay.

People need to have the right to choose between time and money when it comes to bringing up their families. They need to be able to better balance the challenges of work and family in the interests of themselves and their own children. The law needs to be structured in such a way as we did in the Family and Medical Leave Act, that that individual employee choice is protected, and that the employee is protected from retribution in the course of employment by the employer.

I am proud to say that, in the comp time bill, the protection is modeled on the protection in the Family and Medical Leave Act, but it is stronger. I think we have to recognize far more forcefully than we have women's need in the workplace for flexibility.

We believe in personal freedom. We believe in personal responsibility. There could be no equal opportunity without women having the freedom and responsibility to better balance their work and family responsibilities.

So there is much work to be done in many, many areas. But as we go forward in Women's History Month, we must make sure that we all understand not only the progress that women have made, but the degree to which that progress has come specifically as a result in changes in the laws that govern us so that we all do enjoy the same access to education, the same access to health research dollars, the same access to retirement security, the same access to job opportunities, and the same access to protection as employees.

So it has been really a pleasure to join the gentlewoman of the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) this afternoon. It has been a great honor to work with my colleague these 2 years as co-chairs of the Women's Caucus.

I am pleased to see that some of our colleagues have joined us.

Ms. NORTON. I would like to thank my co-chair of the Women's Caucus for those very informative remarks and for her work with me on women's issues in the Congress.

Before I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) who has joined us, I want to also thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for continuing the theme that we have set during this hour; that we are not simply this month celebrating women's history. We in the Congress are celebrating women making history. As such, we are informing women and families of America about just how that history is being made in this body.

Before I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. MORELLA), I do believe we have an obligation to update women and families on new legislation that has just been passed in 1997, much of it through the work and pressure of the Women's Caucus, that affect women.

There are four or five very important such pieces. One is an expansion in mammography coverage. Breast cancer and mammography coverage have been a priority for the women in Congress, important facts for women on Medicaid, which covers not only elderly women but disabled women. We have reduced the age where mammography is covered from 39 years to 50 years. This is important information that is probably not out in the public as yet because it is so new.

We have expanded Medicare and Medicaid coverage for Pap smears, pelvic exams, clinical breast exams, and bone mass exams; this only in the past year, 1997.

□ 1530

We have barred discrimination in Medicare and Medicaid coverage of domestic violence and discrimination in the use of genetic information. This moves us toward correcting abuses that were reported to the Congress. And, of course, I think that there is more general information, as we approach April 15 when taxes must be paid, that we are beginning in this year to have the possibility for families who are raising children under 17 to get a tax credit for those children of \$500.

These are examples of the nuts and bolts of what it means to fight for women in the Congress, to have something to show for it, to listen to what women and families say they need and to fight for it on this floor and to carry that fight over into the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have been joined by the woman who

was the Republican cochair of the Women's Caucus during the 104th Congress, the Congress before this Congress, and a woman who has fought hard for women and families ever since coming to Congress. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, the cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, for yielding. I want to thank her and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), who just spoke earlier, for the leadership that they have shown with the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. I am the former cochair of it and very dedicated to the issues that we have heard espoused and others that need to be done.

I know as we talk about Women's History Month there is no need really to go back to Margaret Brent from my great State of Maryland who in 1648 asked for the right to vote for women, it did not come about until 1920; or to the fact that Eileen Collins has just been appointed to be one who will command a space mission next year. But right now I wanted to focus my comments on just a couple of issues, the issues of child care and family violence.

One of my top priorities for this Second Session of the 105th Congress is to expand access to, and the quality of, child care. To that end I have introduced the Dependent Care Tax Credit Refundability Act, H.R. 2553. It will help working families obtain quality child care.

Currently the dependent care tax credit is a critical source of child care funding for low-income families. Unfortunately, it does not help the poorest of the working poor because it is not refundable. As a result, those who earn too little to pay Federal income taxes do not receive the amount for which they would otherwise be eligible.

My legislation would both expand the credit to help more families and make it refundable to enable the poorest of working families to qualify. It would also include those who provide respite care for ill or disabled dependents.

Over 5 million children under the age of 3 are in the care of others while their parents are at work. Finding quality care for these toddlers is particularly difficult. Research shows that the first 3 years of life are a critical period of brain development, of intellectual growth, of emotional development. Thus for children in child care during these years, the quality of the child care is inextricably linked to their growth and development.

I am pleased to be a sponsor with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) of legislation, the Early Learning and Opportunity State Grants Act of 1997, H.R. 2713. This legislation will provide grants to States

to expand the availability and improve the quality of care for children from infancy through age 3.

College costs and the burden of child care can make a college education inaccessible for many women. Women are twice as likely to have dependents as men, and 3 times as likely to be single parents. For these reasons, I have introduced the College Access Means Parents in School, known as the CAMPUS Act. This legislation will enable more low-income women to get a college education by providing campus-based child care centers.

Often finding affordable quality child care can be an insurmountable barrier for students who have children. The CAMPUS Act will tear down this barrier by providing financial incentives for colleges and universities to establish campus-based child care centers. The good news is that students who have access to campus-based child care centers are more likely to stay in school and graduate than the average college student. Peace of mind that their children are being well cared for enables most of these students to achieve a higher grade point average and to complete their college education in less time than the norm.

It is critical that we address the issue of child care at the earliest opportunity. I will continue my efforts along with the rest of the Women's Caucus to make this assistance a reality.

When the Violence Against Women Act became law in 1994, it changed forever the way the Nation addressed the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault. Today there are more investigations, criminal prosecutions and stiffer penalties for those who cross State lines to commit domestic violence. Millions of dollars have been given to the States to help them reshape the responses of police officers, prosecutors, judges and victims' service providers to violence directed at women. There is increased funding for shelters and there is a national domestic violence hot line.

But the 1994 act could not and did not cover every issue involving violence against women. Working with the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the NOW Legal and Education Defense Fund, the Family Violence Prevention Fund, Ayuda, the Center for Women Policy Studies and many other organizations, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and I have crafted an omnibus bill, dubbed VAWA II, which is Violence Against Women Act II, that will reauthorize programs under the original legislation and also address such issues as child custody, insurance discrimination, battered immigrant women, campus crime, legal services eligibility, medical training, workplace safety, and the problems faced by disabled and by older women.

This shows that much more needs to be done, but the concerted efforts that we hear about here and that we will read about and, I hope, support of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues will note that this Women's History Month will mark the beginning of some significant changes and advances in progress made for all women.

Again I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. I notice that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who is very supportive, is also here to address this body. I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring all the legislation that was mentioned, VAWA, II and ensuring that its critical provisions are approved in the near future.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for coming forward to participate in this special order, for her work last term as cochair of the Women's Caucus and for her continuing hard work with this caucus. I thank her also for those very valuable remarks.

I am pleased to see that as the gentlewoman from Maryland has said, we have been joined by another good friend in the caucus, another very hard worker in the caucus and a very productive and hard worker for women and families in the Congress, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I thank her for her kind words, for her very hard work on behalf of women and for her energy and for her great intelligence. I also thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for celebrating Women's History Month, for participating in this special order and for organizing it in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the House this evening to honor the story behind the creation of National Women's History Month. In doing so, I salute the National Women's History Project from the 6th Congressional District of California, the district that I represent. This year, our Nation celebrates the 150th anniversary of the women's rights movement. In my home district, this is of particular interest and a particularly special occasion because Sonoma County is the birthplace of the National Women's History Project, the organization responsible for the establishment of Women's History Month.

The National Women's History Project of Sonoma County is a non-profit educational organization founded in 1980. The history project is committed to providing education and resources to recognize and celebrate

women's diverse lives and historic contributions to our society. Today they are well known by educators, publishers and journalists as the resource for U.S. women's history information and referrals.

As recently as the 1970s, women's history was virtually an unknown subject. In 1978, as chairwoman of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women, I was astounded, as well as the other members of our commission, by the lack of focus on women.

During this time, with the leadership of Mary Ruthsdotter who followed me as the next chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, the commission designated the week of March 8 for International Women's Remembrance. This celebration throughout county schools was met with enthusiastic response, beyond anything we had anticipated. I am proud to tell Members that this observance marked Sonoma County's first Women's History Week, the first women's history week in the country that we call America.

The key to the celebration was to have communities and schools recognize the importance of women and the mark that women of all cultural backgrounds have made on society and on our history. It soon became a goal to get Congress and the governors nationwide to declare National Women's History Week.

By 1981, with the hard work of the History Project, Congress declared a National Women's History Week. Together, the women of my district and the National Women's History Project succeeded in nationalizing awareness of women's history.

As word of the celebration's success rapidly spread across the country, State departments of education encouraged activities to honor Women's History Week as a way to educate students about the diverse role of women in history. Within a few years, thousands of schools and communities nationwide were celebrating National Women's History Week.

In 1987, the National Women's History Project first petitioned Congress to expand the national celebration to the entire month of March. Due to the project's successful efforts, Congress issued a resolution declaring March Women's History Month. Each year since, nationwide programs and activities on women's history in schools, workplaces and communities have been developed and shared during the month of March.

In honor of Women's History Month, I must also pay a very special tribute to Molly MacGregor, Mary Ruthsdotter, Maria Cuevas, Bonnie Eisenberg, Suanne Otteman, Lisl Christie, Donna Kuhn, Sunny Bristol, Denise Dawe, Kathryn Rankin and Sheree Fisk Williams, the women at the National Women's History Project.

□ 1545

These women from Sonoma County serve as leaders in the effort to educate Americans about the contributions women have made and are making in our society.

The history project works with teachers and leaders of national women's organizations to encourage the development of programs and events that celebrate the diversity of women's lives. The project also works with curriculum specialists in school districts throughout the country to help teachers integrate women's history into the schools.

Under strong and thoughtful leadership, the National Women's History Project has been recognized for outstanding contributions to women's and girls' education by the National Education Association, for diversity in education by the National Association for Multicultural Education, and for scholarship service and advocacy by the Center for Women Policy Studies.

I am grateful to all the devoted women at the National Women's History Project for developing women's history month, and for coordinating this year's 150th anniversary of the women's rights movement for this country.

Again, I am proud to honor the National Women's History Project, an organization which has brought national visibility to women's accomplishments. They have left an indelible mark on Sonoma County and across the Nation. Their legacy and work serve as a reminder of the barriers women have overcome and the barriers that yet remain.

Congratulations, wonderful women, and thank you for all that you have done.

I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), for those very important remarks and for her work with our caucus.

I want to continue to talk about that work. I spoke earlier about new legislation that the caucus worked to get passed last year. I want to speak about new ground we have broken with new approaches to working for women as a part of the Women's Caucus.

We have initiated three new approaches. One is a team approach, a bipartisan team approach. The other is a Women's Caucus hearing approach, and the third is a women's town meeting approach.

Let me say a word about women's bipartisan teams. We are a bipartisan caucus, and we have often worked together on an omnibus legislative bill so we can bring together every bill that women have introduced, and we have put it all into omnibus legislation and we introduced it.

We decided that the Women's Caucus should continue to work on such legis-

lation, but that we ought to work more closely together in teams of Members who have special interests. I think the women and families of America need to know about this team approach.

Did you know that the women of the Women's Caucus are working as teams? That means we Republicans and Democrats led each team, one from each party, on issues that we read from our constituents as among their primary concerns when it comes to women and families.

Let me call out what these teams are, and let me let you know what women Members are working on these teams.

Expanding the work against violence against women, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Preventative health services for women, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN).

Educational child care and school readiness, a major issue this session, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Job training and vocational education, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and here may I say I am calling out the team leaders. There is not enough time to call out all the team members for each important area.

Title IX, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Health care insurance reform, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Juvenile justice, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Women in the military, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Pensions and retirement benefits for women, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY).

Teen pregnancy, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Higher education, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Women-owned businesses, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

HIV-AIDS, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

International women's rights, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-

LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

You have teams, but what do these teams do? Let me offer a representative sample of what these teams have been doing, because I believe that when you hear some of what in fact happens that may not meet the public eye on the floor of the Congress, that women, men and families in America will have some sense of the very hard work that women insist upon doing for women and families.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FOWLER) is a Republican; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) is a Democrat. They have worked like two peas in a pod on an issue that reared its head the first day of the 105th Congress, and that was sexual harassment of women in the military.

As I speak, there is an important trial going on of a high level military official who was accused of sexual harassment. At Aberdeen, they broke a terrible story of drill sergeants who were said to be harassing women in their command.

We are concerned about this, but I do not think the country should be surprised. You cannot change what has occurred over the millennia, which has been putting men and women together in the military, without knowing there will be occasions like this.

The real question is, what are you going to do about it? You ought to expect there will be some occasions like this, and we ought to, I think, be very proud of our armed services, that this is very much the exception and not the rule.

Well, Representatives FOWLER and HARMAN, working closely with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and me, simply decided we were going to press this issue to the finish. I am pleased to report that our team leaders, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FOWLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), worked with the chair of their subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security on military personnel, and brought that work into our caucus so that we could coordinate with that committee as they went all around the country to see whether or not sexual harassment of this kind was present in other installations as well.

This issue has been settled in the Army, as far as I am concerned, because they brought it before us, the secretary of the Army Togo West, and what has happened is an extraordinary report that indicates the action that the Army is going to take.

I have to say that if the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and I sat down to write what had occurred, we

could not have written a better report ourselves.

We think this is going to take care of the sexual harassment in the Army, and I am proud of the work the women in the caucus have done here. We were far more disappointed at the Kassebaum Commission report, because that commission had been established by Defense Secretary Cohen following reports of sexual harassment in the military, a very distinguished commission, which worked very hard.

But I am here to report that the bipartisan Women's Caucus disagrees that women should be separated in training. We think all you do is to delay the problem. If women are separated in training, you are going to get women and men coming together for the first time when they are in fact in the field. Rather work these problems out in training, than to bring them to the field, where we simply cannot afford that kind of intrusion on the work of our Armed Forces.

This is a bipartisan matter. We are not necessarily speaking for Democratic women or Republican women. We are not about to turn back on the notion that we want to further integrate women in the Armed Forces, not move back from where we were. As it is, each service can decide how they are going to do this, and the Marines are not integrating training. But we are not going to stand for moving back, for example, integrated training in the Army, where integrated training has occurred.

If there is a problem, there is a problem at one installation. There may be problems at others. You do not deal with problems by turning back the clock; you deal with problems by rooting out the problems.

There is a commission of people who have studied this matter before in the Armed Forces, and they have said they believe, above all, that women should be further integrated, and not taken back. So the Secretary of Defense is going to have to decide which way to go.

We appreciate what the Kassebaum Commission did and we understand why they did it, but I have to tell you, if anybody had looked closely at the integration of blacks and whites in the services after World War II, I can tell you that there were many incidents, and that it was very hard to get southern white men under the command of black men. But in a command structure, you can do it, and we did it successfully in the military with blacks and whites, and the Women's Caucus is going to demand it be done as well with women and men.

The team has done yeoman service and work, and they continue to be vigilant and report to us in their report to the caucus that they will be looking at specifically gender segregation in the military to see whether or not any-

thing emerges on the floor, so that the entire Women's Caucus will come forward to fight, if need be.

Thus far, all is quiet on the home front. I think that those who want to come forward to try to sex segregate training know that they are going to have a fight on their hands, and I think so far, so good. But be forewarned, you are going to meet a phalanx of women on the floor if you try it, and they are going to be Republican women and they are going to be Democratic women.

Let me go on to report on another team, the Preventative Health Services Team, just to give you an idea of the kinds of things Women's Caucus do that do not always make it to the floor as legislation.

That team, of course, is chaired by team leaders the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), from whom you have just heard, and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN). I should really say Dr. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, by which I mean MD doctor. Dr. GREEN has been a MD for more than 20 years, and is now a Member who represents the Virgin Islands.

An example of what that team has in mind for this year is that among the things that that team will be doing this year is a presentation on breast self examination by Doctor-Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

They reported she is going to discuss proper breast self-examination, and what she is going to do is ask women staff from all over the Congress, the Senate and the House, and she and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) are going to call them together and have a discussion about this, the progress that has been made, and what we need to do to get breast self-examination more widespread.

You will not see that on the floor of the House. That is the kind of innovative thinking and follow through that is typical of these two Members and of Members of this caucus.

Let me give you another example from the work of the team leaders on Women-owned Businesses. That team has as team leaders the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

They have already had a hearing, and I will have a word to say about that later, but they have already had a hearing on women's procurement in the Federal sector. The Federal sector is the granddaddy of all procurement, obviously, because the Federal Government is so large and so many contracts are let, and they found some difficulty as women strive to get more of those contracts.

□ 1600

Let me tell the Members an interesting approach they have taken. To-

gether they have introduced House Resolution 313, which makes recommendations on ways women can gain access to more procurement opportunities for the Federal Government. But being women, who always like to get something done, they have done more than simply introduced the resolution. They have sent copies of their resolution, their follow-up in this session has been to send copies of this resolution to all Federal agencies, encouraging them to implement these recommendations right now, without legislation, as a follow-up to their own women's caucus hearing.

I believe the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) may want to say some more. I will finish with these teams, so if she wants to have something more to say, I will yield more time to her.

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) works on the team on HIV/AIDS. This is an issue that plagues our country still. We have made enormous progress on it, but the disease is moving sideways to women and to people of color. We have to find ways to keep the disease from popping up in a new population. We have done well. We need to do much work, but we have done well with gay men. We cannot have this disease move over to minorities and women, and we need more work here.

They will be sponsoring a briefing with HHS and advocacy groups to discuss access to treatment for low-income HIV-infected women and their families, and Medicaid coverage for such patients. This disease is moving to women, but particularly to low-income women, and particularly to women of color. That will be a real service.

Finally, let me say a word about a follow-up to a hearing that my co-chair, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON) and I had on contraceptive research. We found that the government is not doing contraceptive research anymore. That means more abortions, and that means nobody in the world is doing it, because we pay for most of this research.

We want to encourage more of this research, and we want to encourage more work to cover contraception so that after-the-fact remedies like abortion will become rare, as it is said. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and I sponsored such a women's caucus hearing and we are sending a letter to insurance companies encouraging health plans to provide adequate coverage for contraception. There are all manner of plans that cover abortion and do not cover the pill, do not cover the IUD.

That is an invitation at a time when we have not done enough contraceptive research, it is usually inadequate and I

must say not foolproof methods available to use, and then go to backup remedies which none of us want to encourage. We hope that insurance companies will provide such coverage. I am a cosponsor of the bill, as is the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) that would require companies to do so. But in advance of that and before that bill passes, we would like voluntary compliance.

We are also drafting language regarding contraceptive research funding to start up again the kind of funding that only the most powerful and richest government can do. We do not have adequate contraceptive research for women in America. We do not have it for women in the world. It is one of the great services we could do for the world.

Would the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) have more time she desires before I go further?

Mrs. MORELLA. No, I do not, thank you.

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on the fact that in her discussion of Women's History Month and what the caucus has done, that she has stressed the bipartisan nature, and the fact that we do have partnerships, we do have teams that work together on all of the various issues, whether it is pay equity, child care, domestic violence, HIV/AIDS and health issues, small businesses. I think the gentlewoman has articulated it very well. It really is just the beginning of all of the work that we do, so I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her efforts to make our caucus truly bipartisan, because it certainly takes hard work. We iron out our differences and go ahead. On things we disagree, those do not become caucus issues.

On choice, for example, there are some Members, Democrat and Republican, that are not with us on choice. Therefore, we do not worry with that in the caucus. Those of who are strongly pro-choice will do it on our own or with other Members.

Mr. Speaker, let me finish by saying that the two other groundbreaking approaches the women's caucus has used this session are town meetings and women's caucus hearings. We had a town meeting on pay equity, because we have found that that is a number one issue for women and families. That was a meeting where we did not do most of the talking. We invited women from around the country to do most of the talking. Most of those women came from operations like the business and professional women's clubs of America. It was an important innovation for the women's caucus.

We have had four women's caucus hearings. I mentioned some of the team members. Those hearings have been on zero to 3, the groundbreaking work

that has been done on what we all had better understand about young children and what has to be done. It is to far more adequately stimulate them and get child care for them.

I have mentioned contraceptive research. We have to move ahead on that or else we are inviting more abortion. This last year was the 25th anniversary of Title IX. We had a hearing to commemorate it and to indicate the great unsolved issues under Title IX, and of course I have mentioned the procurement hearing because while there is a 5 percent goal, a voluntary goal, for women for contracts from the Federal Government, we are only at 2 percent. The women's caucus hearing brought that out.

Mr. Speaker I appreciate the time that has been awarded to the 50 Members of Congress for this special order.

HONORING WAYNE FOWLER FOR HIS 32 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, this is a labor of love for me, because it is a privilege for me to rise this afternoon to honor my constituent, Wayne Fowler, for his 32 years of service to the House and the United States Government he has given us. Twenty-two years of that has come right here on our House floor, 6 years as an assistant enrolling clerk and 16 years as an assistant journal clerk.

During his years of service, Mr. Fowler has exhibited a deep appreciation for the value of the legislative process in its purest form, that of the parliamentary actions of the House. Mr. Fowler's devotion to the language of the House Journal, or "journalese," as he calls it, is well known. Wayne never forgot to remind his colleagues that this style of prose has been in use in the House Journal since the second Continental Congress, and that the Constitution mandates the keeping of the House Journal, which is the official record of House proceedings.

Wayne Fowler is a true renaissance man. He is a lover of art, music, and literature. He is an avid bicyclist, which keeps him in such good shape. He is also known to his co-workers as someone who believes in empowering and supporting the work of the young people who also serve this House. He could often be found explaining the procedures of the House to the House pages, something they would never forget, and many of them might go on to become Members of this House and continue to remember that.

Mr. Fowler serves as the verger at St. Columbus Episcopal Church, where he

is responsible for the order of the liturgy and for training and supervising the acolytes.

I want to congratulate Wayne. I want to offer my best wishes to him, to his wife, Anona, their two sons, Wayne and Perry, and their wives, Leslie and Amber. We miss you, Wayne, but we wish you the best in your new adventure, and we thank you for your dedicated service to our House of Representatives and to our great country. Come back and visit.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2495

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted as a cosponsor of H.R. 2495.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PLAN THREATENS TO BRING BACK HUGE FEDERAL DEFICITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for no more than 20 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this week we heard some remarkable news come out of the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office reported that we will see this year an \$8 billion surplus, and I think that is remarkable news for our country, and it is noteworthy to say that a lot of that progress has been made just in the last few years.

I noticed here as I looked back at the 1995 projected deficit, the 1996 projected deficit, and the 1997 projected deficit, that as recently as 1995 the projection was that the deficit this year would be \$164 billion, in 1996 it was going to be \$107 billion, and in 1997, \$22 billion, is what it actually ended up being, and this year we actually have erased the red ink and we are operating in the black.

That is a remarkable achievement, considering from where we have come in these past few years. That is the good news. I think we ought to all reflect on the fact that that is good news. I think, again, it marks the first time in 30 years we have been able to operate in the black, and it is a tribute to the fiscal discipline that has been exercised by the Congress in the last couple of years in trying to get Federal spending under control.

The bad news, of course, is the fact that after years of hard work to eliminate these deficits, President Clinton wants to send the Federal budget back into the red. That is what is shown also in the analysis of the President's budget which was released yesterday by the Congressional Budget Office. The

President's plan breaks the budget and breaks the agreement that we just reached this last year. Worst of all, it breaks faith with the American people.

It took us since 1969, when the first man walked on the Moon, to bring the Federal budget into balance. The President's plan will bring back deficits in just 2 short years. We should have expected that, because the President has proposed some 85 new initiatives costing \$150 billion over the next 5 years.

In addition, he has proposed increasing taxes to their highest level on our society since 1945. Any budget that returns us to the era of more taxes, more spending, and deficits, even for one year, is unacceptable. I think we treated the President's budget with courtesy when it was received on the Hill but declared it dead on arrival, and I think CBO's findings should certainly slam the coffin lid shut on this ill-conceived plan which threatens to wipe out all the progress we have worked so hard to make in bringing down Federal spending and eliminating Federal deficits.

There is an \$8 billion surplus in 1998, a remarkable achievement, and I think that hopefully we can continue down that track to build on surpluses in the future. The other part of the bad news, of course, in all this debate and discussion is the fact that even though we are operating in the black this year on a unified basis, budgetary basis, we still have \$5.5 trillion in debt that we have racked up over the last several years. We need, I think, again, to put a plan in place to retire that debt.

One of the things that we have looked very seriously at, and in fact I have cosponsored, is a plan that has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) which would deal with that very issue. If we can assist and in a systematic way get the discipline that is necessary to reduce the debt over time, we will also eliminate the \$250 billion that we spend annually just to pay interest on the debt.

If we think about the drain on the economy, the drain on the taxpayers of this country, to write a check every year through the appropriations process before we fund anything else, roads and bridges, education, defense, any other priority, the \$250 billion comes off the top to pay the interest on this \$5.5 trillion debt. That is a very serious problem and one we need to come to grips with.

Having said that, I have cosponsored a plan which will address that. It does it in a very simple way. First of all, it says that any time we run a surplus in this country, that we ought to take two-thirds of that surplus and dedicate it to paying down the debt, to retiring the debt, and secondly, to restoring the trust funds: the Social Security trust fund, the highway trust fund, the environmental trust funds. That has to be the priority, first of all, to deal with

those issues. Then finally, the last third would be used to lower taxes on the hardworking people of this country.

But it basically makes a statement, an assertion, that we will not commit ourselves to embark down a path or journey down the road towards additional Washington spending and new Washington spending, new Washington programs, until first we have taken care of the debt that is looming out there, and that is going to choke off future generations; that we have addressed the trust fund issues and ensured that Social Security will be there, not only for people who depend upon it today, but also in the future. Then finally, that we give something back to the taxpayers, after all, whose money it is in the first place. I believe that is a very logical, commonsensical approach to dealing with the potential surplus.

Furthermore, this plan over time would completely eliminate the debt by saying that over the course of the next several years we will not spend any more than 99 percent of the revenue that the government collects. In other words, each year we will run a 1 percent surplus that will be directly applied to the debt, so that over time, based upon current economic assumptions, we can, by the year 2026, systematically do away with the debt that is hanging like a cloud over our country's future.

So I believe it is a plan that merits the consideration, the debate, of this body, and hopefully the support on both sides of the aisle, because realistically, I think we have all proven in the past that Congress does not have the discipline, short of a plan like this, that will enable us to deal with the debt and also to continue to keep Federal spending under control.

□ 1615

Any time in Washington we start talking surplus, we have all kinds of people who have ways of spending it. And I think, again, it is something that may be a liberal politician's dream to talk surpluses, but it should be the taxpayers' nightmare.

We need to have a plan in place which addresses that not only for the short term but for the long term, and this legislation, H.R. 2191, the Debt Repayment Act, deals with that very issue.

Having said that, I also believe that in terms of the longevity of Social Security and where we need to be going with respect to that program, that we need some serious fundamental reforms. I think for the first time in a long time in a bipartisan way we are talking about the looming crisis that is ahead of us, and I find that to be very encouraging.

The fact of the matter is, as well, that we also borrow each year about

\$100 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund and use it, apply it to the overall budget. It makes the budget deficit look smaller. But this year to the extent that we have done that, \$100 billion has been used out of the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the true size of the Federal deficit. \$650 billion has been borrowed from the Social Security trust fund and applied to the overall cost of running the government.

That is an issue that I also think we need to address, and erect a fire wall between the trust fund and the general budget so that in the future the people that pay into the Social Security Trust Fund through payroll tax have an assurance that their dollars are going to be used for the purpose they were intended. That should be a matter of practice and policy, that we have truth in budgeting and that we have accountability from our government and that no Social Security dollars are robbed to pay for new Washington spending. I think that is what we have been doing these last many years, and that is a practice which certainly needs to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, as we move into this discussion of potential budget surpluses, it is again very important that we deal with the long-range issues, the debt, the trust funds. But before we again embark upon long-term new spending for government programs, we must do a serious evaluation about what is in the best interest of the people in this country who have needs.

As I travel my State of South Dakota, I hear a lot of different concerns. I talk to young families, husbands and wives who are trying very hard to juggle jobs and schedules so that they can pay the bills, pay for day care, think about their children's education, look at retirement issues, what they can do to put some aside, and then hope to have enough time to see their kids and each other at the end of the week.

I talk to college students who are taking full loads of classes plus trying to work on top of that, 40 hours a week in some cases, in order to pay for their education. I talk to retired senior citizens who are concerned because they see what Washington is doing with the Social Security and Medicare programs, and they want to see that those programs are there not only for them but there for their children and grandchildren.

I talk to young professionals who are starting out their careers and who laugh when asked if they think that Social Security will be there for them when they retire. That question was recently asked of young people in this country, and the survey results found that more people believe in UFOs than believe that Social Security is going to be around for retirement.

We may have today a budget surplus, but we have some serious challenges

ahead of us and ones which I think we need to come to grips with. It is going to take continued fiscal discipline along the lines of the plan that I have just been discussing.

When we look beyond those issues at whether or not, in terms of addressing society's needs out there, whether it is child care or education or retirement or health care, should we create new Washington-based programs to address those. Or should we say, again as a matter of fundamental policy, that we believe the people of this country are in a better position to make decisions about how to meet their needs, and therefore we ought to give more money back to them in the form of tax relief. I think that is a very clear choice.

We ought to allow the people of this country to participate in the benefits of a growing economy. When we look at where the American economy is today and the tax burden that we place on Americans, as I noted earlier in terms of the overall tax burden, entirely in terms of tax revenues collected, we are now approaching right at 20 percent of the total gross domestic product of our entire economy going in the form of tax revenues. The highest level since 1945. That is the collective burden.

How that plays out with individuals and families, when we sit down and figure it out, there were some statistics that came out the other day which said that over the past couple of decades that the tax burden has grown, the collective burden, Federal, State and local, to 38.2 percent. That is a remarkable number, when we think that 38 cents out of every dollar that a family in this country makes is going to pay taxes in one form or another.

Again, I think it ought to be a goal and it has been a goal articulated by our majority, the Republican leadership in the Congress, that we ought to work toward a 25 percent tax burden. Federal, State and local taxes should not exceed 25 percent of a family's income.

Mr. Speaker, I think that ought to be more than a goal and we ought to systematically work to where that becomes a reality. Someone said that God only asks for 10 percent, certainly the government could get by on two-and-a-half times that amount, so 25 percent ought to be the goal that we strive for.

Before we go back into the budget wilderness that we have been wandering in for the last 30 years, we ought to look at what we can do to return some of the dollars that the people in this country who are very hard-working and are contributing and making this economy grow, how we can give some of that back to them in the form of tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a couple of pieces of legislation which I think are consistent with that principle, and also address the issue of tax

relief in a way which I think is consistent with what certainly is my philosophy and I would hope would be the philosophy of most Americans; that is that we ought to allow everybody to participate as much as they can in a very broad-based way in the benefits of a growing economy. That is one of the principles that underscores our legislation.

Secondly, to the extent that we can provide any form of tax relief in this body, that we ought to do it in a way that further simplifies, not complicates, the Tax Code. Every time the Congress touches the Tax Code, as they have repeatedly since 1986, which was supposed to be the tax reform movement to end all tax reforms, we have had some 4,000 modifications to the Tax Code in this country. More laws, more regulations, more rules, more pages of instruction to the point that today we have 34½ pounds of laws, regulations and rules and instructions, 480 tax forms. It becomes increasingly more complicated.

If we could do something that would liberate the people of this country, the individuals, the families, the businesses, from the burden that is imposed by just the complexity of this Tax Code, I think we would create more jobs, we would see the economy continue to grow even faster, because it is an incredible drag on the economy to see what we do in terms of our tax policy.

But having said that, let me briefly describe the nature of our two tax bills. First of all, we have said that one of the ways we can deliver tax relief is by raising the personal exemption. Everybody in this country claims a personal exemption and then one for their dependents. We would raise that from the current \$2,700 to \$3,400, thereby reducing the taxable income that each individual and each family in this country is responsible for.

If a taxpayer is paying at the 15 percent category and they are a family of four, that is going to amount to \$400 of tax relief. For someone in the 28 percent tax bracket, that is \$800 of tax relief each year. That is real relief. That allows people in this country to make real choices about what their priorities are and how they want to spend those tax dollars. If it is on child care, they could buy 12 weeks of child care with that, or 16 weeks of groceries. They could make a couple of mortgage payments or car payments, or start putting something aside for education. That is real relief for working Americans. That is the philosophy that we bring to this.

The second bill is also geared toward the concept of simplifying the code, moving more people into the 15 percent tax bracket. It would raise the income thresholds at which the 28 percent rate applies today. For example, for a married couple that is currently \$42,350; we

would raise that to \$70,000. So, in other words, they could make \$70,000 before they start paying taxes at the 28 percent level as opposed to the 15 percent level.

Mr. Speaker, that gives people in this country an incentive to work harder, to earn more, to improve their lot in life because they know that each time they earn an additional dollar, they are only going to have 15 cents taken in taxes as opposed to a higher 28 cents if they fall into that tax category.

What our legislation does is it drops 10 million filers out of the higher 28 percent bracket down into the 15 percent bracket, thereby lowering their tax bracket on average about \$1,200 on average per filer. Mr. Speaker, 29 million people in this country would see their tax bills lowered as a result of our legislation.

These are bills that bring real relief and real choices to working families in this country. They do it, as I said earlier, in a way that delivers relief in a broad-based way. People in the lower and middle income categories realize the biggest proportionate share of the tax relief, but everybody up through the income structure, rate structure, will realize tax relief, and that is significant because it gets us away from this notion of targeting and picking winners and losers out of Washington.

I think a big mistake in tax policy in the past is that we try to micromanage behavior. We try to say to people if they will behave this way or jump through these hoops, that we will reward them. We in Washington will reward them by giving them some form of tax relief.

Our bills, on the other hand, are consistent with the philosophy that says that in an equal way, everybody in this country, whether they are single or whether they are married or whether they have children or whatever their status is, if they are a working person who pays taxes, they get tax relief. That is straightforward and simple and common sense. It delivers tax relief in a way that is consistent with our principles and philosophy.

Recently I was reading a Wall Street Journal op-ed piece by Charles Murray on Friday, February 20, which reinforces this philosophy. What he says is, "The power of incentives to affect behavior is not at issue, nor is the power of government to effect incentives. But just as the information needed to organize an economy is too complex for central economic planners to collect and use, so are the incentives that shape human behavior too complex for central planners to engineer. The legislators write a law that pushes policy lever A and opens spending valve B, and they may indeed produce a measurable behavioral output. But it usually has no relationship to the intended output, or worse, it is the exact opposite."

Mr. Speaker, I think as we head down the road in looking again at any kind of tax relief that we might be able to do this year or next year, whenever the budget situation that we are dealing with enables us to do that, we ought to be looking at tax relief that is consistent with the principles that are outlined in our legislation.

I want to credit the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), who is an original cosponsor, in helping me with this legislation. The gentlewoman is a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, a member of the House leadership, and we have since that time added several cosponsors. We are going to continue to advance this particular proposal in a way that again I think will resonate with the American people, the people who pay the taxes, and hopefully will draw the attention of policymakers here in Washington.

I would just like to, in winding up today, point out the favorable review it is meeting within my home State of South Dakota. Look at the Brookings Register, the editorial, "In Thune, Taxpayers Should Trust." I do not think that is a reflection on me, but it is the proposal that we have outlined and one that they said is very much consistent with principles.

The Mitchell Daily Republic, "Thune Tax Plan is Real Tax Relief." That is the kind of reviews our proposal is meeting with back home. And out here, in New York, Investor's Business Daily calls it "real tax relief." This is the kind of response that we are meeting with.

Again, I think it is very, very much in line with where we ought to be going in this country in terms of tax policy, again with the long-term goal in the year 2000 of coming up with a new Tax Code for a new century. That is where we ultimately need to be.

I am going to continue to advocate for tax reform. But until we get there, to the extent that we are able to offer tax relief, it ought to be consistent with the legislation that we have introduced. I look forward to working with other Members of this body to see that this becomes a reality.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of dental reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. FOWLER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SANFORD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, on March 10.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Ms. ESHOO.
Ms. KILPATRICK.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.
Ms. CARSON.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. KIND.
Mr. BLUMENAUER.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. GRAHAM.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. BARTON of Texas.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
Mr. BUNNING.
Mr. BRADY.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. PAUL.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. THUNE) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. WELLER.
Mr. HILL.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
Mr. WEYGAND.
Mr. CLYBURN.
Ms. FURSE.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.
Mr. PASCRELL.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. JOHN.

Mr. GILMAN.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. ROHRBACHER.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. TIERNEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1998, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7718. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendment to the Tobacco Marketing Quota Regulations (RIN: 0560-AE96) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7719. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Use of Binders in "Ham with Natural Juices" Products [Docket No. 96-040F] (RIN: 0583-AC29) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7720. A letter from the Manager Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—General Crop Insurance Regulations; Table Grape Crop Insurance Regulations and Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Table Grape Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 441 and 457] received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7721. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—General Crop Insurance Regulations, Safflower Seed Crop Insurance Endorsement; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Safflower Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AA79) March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7722. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Ineligibility for Programs Under the General Crop Insurance Act (RIN: 0563-AB01) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7723. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Risk Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Pear Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB03) received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7724. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy and Programs, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, transmitting the Institution's final rule—Bank Enterprise Award Program (RIN: 1505-AA71) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7725. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hispanic-Serving Institutions Work Study Program [Docket No. FR-4269-I-01] (RIN: 2528-AA07) received February 25, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7726. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Manufactured Home Tires, Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation; and Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards [Docket No. FR-3943-F-02] received February 25, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7727. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Determination of Economically Depressed Regions (RIN: 3064-AB08) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7728. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Reclassification; Fairbanks, Alaska Non-attainment Area; Carbon Monoxide [AK 17-1705; FRL-5971-4] received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7729. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5963-8] received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7730. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan for Texas: General Conformity Rules [TX 62-1-7271A; FRL-5971-7] received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7731. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [CA-011-0063; FRL-5966-8] received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7732. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants Arkansas; Revisions and Regulations [AR-2-2-5972a; FRL-5954-4] received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7733. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites [FRL-5973-9] received March 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7734. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Manufacture of Halon Blends, Intentional Release of Halon, Technician Training and Disposal of Halon and Halon-Containing Equipment (RIN: 2060-AH44) received March 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7735. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on Chemical and Biological Weapons Defense, pursuant to Condition 11(F) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997; (H. Doc. No. 105-224); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7736. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7737. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Retirement and Insurance—Exemption From Continuity Of Coverage Requirements For Certain Decennial Census Employees With Dual Appointments (RIN: 3206-A112) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7738. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Retirement and Insurance Benefits When An Annuitant Is Missing (RIN: 3206-AH75) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7739. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Supplemental Regulations for Administration of Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge (RIN: 1018-AE19) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7740. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Fund Reauthorization Implementation (RIN: 1029-AB93) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7741. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for H-2B Temporary Labor Certification in Non-agricultural Occupations [Title 20 CFR Parts 652, 655 and 656.40, 8 CFR 214.2(h), 408 FR 2587, GALT No. 1-95] received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7742. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau Model ASW-19 Sailplanes

[Docket No. 97-CE-101-AD; Amendment 39-10357; AD 98-04-46] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7743. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCAT-A Groupe AEROSPATIALE Models TB9, TB10, and TB200 Airplanes [Docket No. 95-CE-70-AD; Amendment 39-10358; AD 98-04-47] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7744. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-500M Gliders [Docket No. 97-CE-131-AD; Amendment 39-10342; AD 98-04-30] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7745. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and F.28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-274-AD; Amendment 39-10361; AD 98-04-50] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7746. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-204; Yakima, WA [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7747. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4164, PW4168, and PW4168A Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 97-ANE-44-AD; Amendment 39-10326; AD 98-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7748. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-366G1 Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-09-AD; Amendment 39-10363; AD 98-05-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7749. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 750 Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-38-AD; Amendment 39-10364; AD 98-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7750. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-10356; AD 98-04-45] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7751. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness

Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR72 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-280-AD; Amendment 39-10354; AD 98-04-43] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7752. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hull Examination Alternatives for Passenger Vessels [USCG-1998-3569] received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7753. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operations Regulations; Tacoma Harbor, WA [CGD13-98-001] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received March 3, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7754. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Withdrawal from Federal Regulations of the Applicability to Alaska's Waters of Arsenic Human Health Criteria [FRL 5971-9] received February 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7755. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Update of Ports Subject to the Harbor Maintenance Fee [T.D. 97-45] (RIN: 1515-AA57) received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7756. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Compensation for Certain Undiagnosed Illnesses (RIN: 2900-A177) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7757. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Treatment of Research-Related Injuries to Human Subjects (RIN: 2900-AH68) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7758. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change from dollar approximate separate transactions method of accounting/change (DASTM) to the profit and loss method of accounting/change from the profit and loss method to DASTM [TD 8765] (RIN: 1545-A124; 1545-AS68) received March 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7759. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 98-15] received March 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7760. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Addition of Midland International Airport to List of Designated Landing Locations for Private Aircraft [T.D. 97-35] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7761. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—Establishment of Port of Entry at Spirit of St. Louis Airport [T.D. 97-7] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7762. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Technical Amendments to the Customs Regulations [T.D. 97-82] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7763. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Customs Service Field Organization; Establishment of Sanford Port of Entry [T.D. 97-64] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7764. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Customs Service Field Organization; Establishment of Sanford Port of Entry [T.D. 97-88] received February 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3337. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carrier baggage liability to be not less than \$2,000 per passenger; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FROST, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. REYES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 3338. A bill to ensure excellent recruitment and training of math and science teachers at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3339. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to ensure that rice farms covered by a production flexibility contract remain in rice production during the term of the contract when the principal producer of rice on the farm is a tenant or sharecropper; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 3340. A bill to provide an exemption from certain import prohibitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 3341. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to strengthen the naturalization process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. KLINK, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN, Ms. HARMAN,

Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KLECKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. STARK, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEGGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YATES, and Mr. MASCARA):

H.R. 3342. A bill to prohibit discrimination or retaliation against health care workers who report unsafe conditions and practices which impact on patient care; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3343. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the textile industry and in water treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3344. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the paper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3345. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in water treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3346. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in water treatment and beauty care products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3347. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in photography products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3348. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in peroxide stabilizer and compounding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 3349. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the textile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 3350. A bill to direct the Foreign Trade Zones Board to expand Foreign Trade Zone No. 143 to include an area of the municipal airport of Chico, California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 3351. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish the Protect Social Security Account into which the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit budget surpluses until a reform measure is enacted to ensure the long-term solvency of the OASDI trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. RILEY):

H.R. 3352. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to repeal the housing guaranty program under that Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JOHN, and Mrs. EMERSON):
H.R. 3353. A bill to direct the United States representatives at certain international financial institutions to insist that the institutions uphold the trade liberalization commitments made by the Asian countries receiving assistance from such institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3354. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on trifluoromethylaniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3355. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-chloro-N-[2,6-dinitro-4-(trifluoromethyl) phenyl]-N-ethyl-6-fluorobenzenemethanamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3356. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on streptomycin sulfate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3357. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on propanoic acid, 2-(4-chloro-3-fluoro-2-pyridinyl)oxy-phenoxy-2-propynyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3358. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2, 4-dichloro-3,5-dinitrobenzotrifluoride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3359. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acetic acid, (5-chloro-8-quinolinyl)oxy-, 1-methylhexyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3360. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acetic acid, 2-chloro-4-fluoro-5-(tetrahydro-3-oxo-1H, 3H-1,3,4-thiadiazolo 3,4-a pyridazin-1-ylidene) amino phenylthio-, methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3361. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on orthonitrophenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3362. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on chloroacetone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3363. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on calcium oxytetracycline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3364. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sodium N-methyl-N-oleoyl taurate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3365. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dialkyl-naphthalene sulfonic acid sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3366. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on O-(6-chloro-3-phenyl-4-pyridazinyl)-S-octyl-carbonothioate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3367. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-cyclopropyl-6-methyl-2-phenylamino-pyrimidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3368. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on O,O-Dimethyl-S-5-methoxy-2-oxo-1,3,4-thiadiazol-3-(2H)-yl-methyl-dithiophosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3369. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (Ethyl 2-(4-phenoxyphenoxy) ethyl

carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3370. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-(4-methoxy-6-methyl-triazin-2-yl)-3-(2-(3,3,3-trifluoropropyl)-phenylsulfonyl)-urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3371. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(4,6-Bis (difluoromethoxy)-pyrimidin-2-yl)-1-(2-methoxycarbonylphenylsulfonyl) urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3372. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-(2-(2-chloroethoxy)-phenylsulfonyl)-urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:
H.R. 3373. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (2S, 4R)/(2R, 4S)/(2R, 4R)/(2S, 4S)-1-(2-(4-(4-chloro-phenoxy)-2-chlorophenyl-4-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-yl-methyl)-1H-1,2,4-triazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAPO:
H.R. 3374. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for temporary duty-free treatment for semiconductor plating lines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3375. A bill to provide for the temporary reduction of duty on synthetic quartz substrates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENSIGN:
H.R. 3376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to taxpayers who use certain clean-burning fuels as a motor vehicle fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVEAGA:
H.R. 3377. A bill to clarify the rules of origin for textile and apparel products from American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FURSE:
H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes", to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire additional lands for Fort Clatsop National Memorial in accordance with the Fort Clatsop National Memorial's General Management Plan dated June 1995; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:
H.R. 3379. A bill to restore food stamp benefits for aliens; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HEFLEY:
H.R. 3380. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to public charter operations at certain reliever airports; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 3381. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to exchange land and other assets with Big Sky Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 3382. A bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut:
H.R. 3383. A bill to amend Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990 to authorize the limited acquisition of additional acreage for the historic site to permit the development of visitor and administrative facilities and to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts for the acquisition of real and personal property; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3384. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3385. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the production of anti-HIV/anti-AIDS drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3386. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the production of anti-cancer drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3387. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the production of anti-cancer drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3388. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain drug substance used as an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3389. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain drug substance used as an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3390. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3391. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3392. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3393. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:
H.R. 3394. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals used in the formulation of an HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCREY:
H.R. 3395. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain printing machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDADE (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 3396. A bill to establish standards of conduct for Department of Justice employees, and to establish a review board to monitor compliance with such standards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 3397. A bill to require an employer which is subject to the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act and who gives a notice of a plant closing to negotiate in good faith regarding possible means of using the plant and equipment for continued employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. COMBEST, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 3398. A bill to eliminate the requirement that fingerprints be supplied for background checks on volunteers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. PAXON):

H.R. 3399. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to improve the availability of child care and development services during periods outside normal school hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 3401. A bill to suspend until December 31, 2002, the duty on parts for use in the manufacture of loudspeakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 3402. A bill to suspend until December 31, 2002, the duty on certain electrical transformers for use in the manufacture of audio systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 3403. A bill to suspend until December 31, 2002, the duty on loudspeakers not mounted in their enclosures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 3404. A bill to require additional public education, outreach, and participation with respect to the disposal of napalm and certain other materials owned or controlled by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 3405. A bill to amend the child and adult care food program under the National School Lunch Act to revise the eligibility of private organizations under that program; to

the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3406. A bill to clarify the regulation of Alaskan Guide Pilots conducting air flights in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution calling for an end to the violent repression of the legitimate rights of the people of Kosovo; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that any Executive order that infringes on the powers and duties of the Congress under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, or that would require the expenditure of Federal funds not specifically appropriated for the purpose of the Executive order, is advisory only unless enacted as law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. MARKEY):

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution voicing concern about the serious limitations on human rights and civil liberties in Belarus, including lack of compliance with Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) commitments, and urging the President to take these into consideration in his determination of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Belarus; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENSIGN:

H. Res. 379. A resolution returning to the Senate the bill S. 104; considered and agreed to

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HILL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

H. Res. 380. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that no change in the water level of Lake Powell is justified or appropriate; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FROST, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICA,

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H. Res. 381. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should renegotiate the extradition treaty with Mexico so that the possibility of capital punishment will not interfere with the timely extradition of criminal suspects from Mexico to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania introduced A bill (H.R. 3407) to provide for the reliquidation of certain entries of self-tapping screws; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 218: Mr. GREEN and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 336: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 371: Mr. LANTOS and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 453: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 612: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 662: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 758: Mr. BATEMAN.
H.R. 836: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 919: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 970: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 981: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 991: Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1117: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1126: Mr. RYUN and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1151: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FROST, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. BALDACC.
H.R. 1166: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1231: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NEY, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1234: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1362: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 1689: Mr. RILEY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LAZIO of New York.
H.R. 1704: Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 1711: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. JOHN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1766: Ms. CARSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HILL, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WISE, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1870: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1995: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. McNULTY, Mr.

LAMPSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2009: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2154: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2224: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2228: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2351: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 2431: Mr. CONDT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2499: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 2670: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 2718: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 2754: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2760: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2829: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2870: Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2876: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2884: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 2912: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2914: Mr. DOOLEY of California and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2921: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. EWING, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2970: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2993: Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 3011: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3033: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 3039: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3147: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 3152: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3156: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3166: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3206: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 3211: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. CALAHAN.

H.R. 3213: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3246: Mr. SNOWBARGER and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3260: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 3265: Mr. YATES, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. NORTUP, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3281: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3287: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3297: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3304: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3331: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. BACHUS.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado and Mr. PORTMAN.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. COBURN.

H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 209: Mr. BLILEY and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. LEACH, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KIM, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 227: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 304: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Res. 340: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 363: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H. Res. 375: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HEFLEY.